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## Executive Summary

Since 2004, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has conducted the Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS). The EAVS asks all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and four U.S. territories-American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands-to provide data about the way in which Americans voted in each Federal election. The EAVS is the preeminent source of state and local jurisdiction-level election administration data collected after each Federal election. It provides policymakers and the public with key information about how their democracy functioned in the election. In 2016, only 30 of the 6,467 jurisdictions in the survey did not provide any response.

Turnout: Data reported to the EAVS show a total of 140,114,502 citizens who voted in the 2016 General Election, representing a national turnout rate of 63 percent of the Citizen Voting Age Population.

Voter Registration: Between the close of voter registration for the 2014 election and the close of voter registration for the 2016 election, more than 77.5 million voter registration applications were received by states. State motor vehicle offices remain the most common place where individuals register to vote ( 32.7 percent of all registrations) but online registration (17.4 percent of the total) has increased dramatically over the past four years as a source of registrations.

Pre-Election Voting: Voting before Election Day—either absentee by mail or using in-person early voting-continues to be a very popular way to vote. Nationally, 41 percent of all votes cast in the 2016 election were cast before Election Day.

Absentee Voting: Absentee voting rates vary dramatically across states, depending on the ease with which individuals can cast an absentee ballot in a state. Nationally, 80.1 percent of absentee ballots transmitted to voters were returned, and most states reported that over 90 percent of absentee ballots "returned and submitted for counting" were ultimately counted in the 2016 General Election.

Military and Overseas Voting: Members of the uniformed services and their dependents, as well as civilians living overseas, receive special protections voting under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA). In 2016, 930,156 UOCAVA ballots were transmitted and 68.1 percent of these ballots were returned.

Precinct and Polling Places: Administration of the November 8, 2016, General Election was a massive undertaking. Nationwide, there were 178,217 individual precincts (geographic voting areas to which individuals are assigned and that determine the ballot type that voters receive) and 116,990 physical polling places (the locations where people can vote on Election Day). In addition, jurisdictions operated more than 8,500 early voting locations in the days leading up to the election.

Poll Workers: Recruiting poll workers continues to be a challenge for many jurisdictions: nearly half reported that they had a somewhat difficult or very difficult time recruiting poll workers. The poll worker population remains skewed toward older Americans, with 24 percent of poll workers ages 71 and older and another 32 percent ages 61-70.

Provisional Voting: There were 2.5 million provisional ballots cast in 2016, with nearly half of those ballots cast in California. Of the provisional ballots cast, 71 percent were counted either partially or in full.
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## Introduction

Since 2004, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has conducted the Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS). The EAVS asks all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. four territories-American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands-to provide data about the way in which Americans voted in each Federal election, and includes questions regarding voter registration, absentee voting, voting by individuals covered by the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), provisional voting, election technology, poll workers, polling places, and total turnout. ${ }^{1}$ The EAVS satisfies the EAC's requirements under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) to serve as a clearinghouse of election data. The sections of the EAVS related to voter registration and UOCAVA voting allow states to satisfy their data reporting requirements established by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) and under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA).

In 2016, 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three U.S. territories (Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) submitted and certified EAVS data. These states and territories are comprised of 6,467 jurisdictions, of which 6,437 (99 percent) are included in the 2016 EAVS data. It is important to note that state and national totals include all jurisdictions for which data were available on a given item. Response rates for each section of the survey are available in the methodological appendix at the end of this report. ${ }^{2}$ Efforts were made to maximize the completeness and accuracy of the data reported here. Where possible, information missing for a state or jurisdiction was competed using responses to other survey items. All such corrections and adjustments are described in the table notes that follow each data table.

Since 2008, the EAC has also administered the Statutory Overview survey, which asks states to report on their election laws, definitions, and procedures. Information from the Statutory Overview is included throughout this report to provide context for the quantitative administrative data reported in the EAVS.

## Election Administration in the United States

Although the specific procedures and practices of election administration are constantly evolving, elections in the United States follow a standard process. As shown in Figure 1, elections can be viewed as a cycle: eligible citizens are registered to vote; polling places are selected; poll workers are hired; and voting systems are chosen.

In 2016, for about 40 percent of the population, voting started weeks before Election Day, as voters either cast absentee ballots by mail or voted early in person. U.S. citizens living overseas and members of the uniformed services and their eligible family, whose voting rights are protected by UOCAVA, voted early or absentee by mail. On Election Day, registered voters cast ballots in polling places from coast to coast. On election night and the days after, ballots were tabulated, provisional ballots were adjudicated, post-election audits occurred, the final canvas of votes was conducted, and the election was certified.

## Figure 1: The U.S. Election Process



Election administration outcomes and experiences are then used to evaluate the laws and procedures used in elections. Often, the successful innovations implemented in one state during an election are adopted by other states in subsequent elections. For example, in 2016, Utah saw a marked increase in votes cast by absentee ballot because the state adopted laws and procedures that encouraged counties to administer their election using all by-mail voting, as had been done previously by other states.

## Overall Turnout in 2016

When assessing election administration, one primary outcome of interest is turnout. In this report, two different approaches are used to measure voter turnout. The first method is to compare the number of Americans who voted as a percentage of the civilian voting age population (CVAP). According to the EAVS, 140,114,502 Americans voted in the 2016 General Election. This number represents 63 percent of the CVAP nationally. The data in Figure 2 show that approximately half of all states had turnout rates between 60 and 70 percent of CVAP. Five states-Oregon, Maine, New Hampshire, Minnesota, and Colorado-had CVAP turnout rates of more than 70 percent.

Figure 2. Turnout as Percentage of CVAP, 2016


## Registering to Vote

Beginning in the 1800s, most states have required individuals to register to vote before they can participate in an election. Today, every state except North Dakota has voter registration. In most states, the deadline for registering to vote is within a few weeks of Election Day. However, 15 states allow individuals to register to vote at the polls on Election Day: Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Seven additional states reported allowing some form of Same Day Registration (SDR). ${ }^{3}$

In almost all states, the processes for maintaining voter registration rolls and the standard ways by which individuals can register to vote are governed by the NVRA ${ }^{4}$, which created uniform requirements for the locations where individuals should be able to register to vote. It also established the process by which states maintain their voter registration rolls.

There are 38 states that differentiate their registered voters as "active" and "inactive" voters. An inactive voter is typically a person who appears to have moved outside of the jurisdiction but has not responded to a confirmation of address notice. With proper notification, a state can remove a person from the voter registration rolls if the registrant dies, requests to be removed, or moves outside of the jurisdiction where he or she was registered. Individuals who do not respond to a confirmation of address notice and then do not vote in two or more consecutive Federal general elections can also be removed from the rolls. If state law allows, individuals can be removed based on a finding of mental incapacity, or upon a criminal conviction. Detailed information about state laws and registration processes can be found in the Statutory Overview report and the NVRA report. ${ }^{5}$

## How Americans Register to Vote

The EAVS asks states to report the number of registration forms that they received and the source of these registrations. Several specific methods for voter registration are examined:

1. In-Person Registration. This mode of registration occurs at different places, including the state motor vehicle agencies, public assistance and disability offices, armed forces recruitment offices, other state-funded agencies, and agencies mandated by state law but not explicitly listed in the NVRA.
2. Mail, Email, or Fax. These methods allow individuals to use either a federal or state registration form-a printed copy or a version downloaded from the Internet-and return it to their state or local election offices to be processed.
3. Online Voter Registration. There are differences on the process used for this type of registration across states but, in general, this method allows voters to complete a form online and submit it electronically to be evaluated by election officials. An online registrant typically has to have a valid driver's license from the state in which they want to register online; the driver's license is used as part of the process of verifying the person's identity.
4. Same Day Voter Registration. This option allows a person to register to vote and cast a ballot on the same day. SDR is governed by state laws and is allowed statewide in 15 states. Alaska and Rhode Island only allow SDR in Presidential elections.
5. Automatic Registration: The state of Oregon approved a law to implement a new motor voter act starting on January 1, 2016. Unlike registration in other states and territories, Oregon's registration program uses an opt-out instead of opt-in. This opt-in rule means that, when Oregonians who meet eligibility criteria for registering to vote use the services of designated state offices (e.g., motor vehicle department), they are automatically registered to vote without the need of completing an application.

Figure 3 shows the percentage of voter registration applications for the 2016 General Election that came from various sources. The most common source of registrations across the country was from departments of motor vehicles (DMV), representing more than 25 million new registration applications received. Online registration continued to grow in popularity, with 13.5 million new applications received in 2016; mail, email, and fax combined accounted for 13.4 million new applications over this same period. Online registration has grown at a fast pace: it accounted for 17.4 percent of new registrations for the 2016 election, compared to 6.5 percent in 2014 and 5.3 percent in 2012.

Figure 3. Source of New Voter Registration Forms, 2016


## Poll Book Technology

When voters go into polling places, their identity is checked against the voter registration rolls to ensure that they are registered to vote and did not already vote during in-person early voting or by-mail absentee voting. ${ }^{6}$ Most jurisdictions across the United States ( 81.8 percent) use preprinted paper registration lists to check in voters at the polls. In 89 percent of jurisdictions that only use paper lists, the local jurisdiction prints the poll books. ${ }^{7}$

From 2012 to 2016, there was a 75 percent increase nationally in the use of electronic poll books in elections. In 2012, 645 jurisdictions- 7.9 percent of all jurisdictions nationallyreported using e-poll books to sign in voters. By 2016, 1,146 jurisdictions-17.7 percent of all jurisdictions-used e-poll books and 1,109 jurisdictions used them to sign in voters at the polls. Some of these jurisdictions used e-poll books to update voter history and to locate polling places. Figure 4 illustrates how jurisdictions with e-poll books use them to facilitate management of the electoral process.

Figure 4. Electronic Poll Book Uses by Jurisdictions, $2016^{8}$


## Pre-Election Voting

Over the past 20 years, the number of voters casting ballots using by-mail absentee and inperson early voting has increased dramatically. More states have adopted these modes of voting in an effort to make voting more convenient, and voters are taking advantage of these new options for voting. By-mail absentee voting allows individuals to receive their ballot in the mail before the election and then mark their ballot at their leisure. The voter typically puts his or her marked ballot in an envelope and then mails it to his or her local election office or places it in an absentee ballot drop-off box. In-person early voting-which some states refer to as in-person absentee voting-allows a person to have the same experience voting as they would if they voted on Election Day. The voter typically votes on the same type of voting equipment as they would on Election Day, but does so during the weeks leading up to Election Day.

In 2016, 41.3 percent of all ballots were cast before Election Day. Of the total turnout, 17.2 percent of ballots were cast using in-person early voting and 23.7 percent were cast using bymail absentee voting. ${ }^{9}$

## Absentee Voting

By-mail absentee voting was developed to allow individuals who would be away from their polling place on Election Day to receive and return a ballot early, so they could still participate in the election. Originally, voters usually had to provide a valid reason why they would not be present on Election Day (e.g., they would be away on travel or be physically unable to get to the polls). Today, there are generally five types of absentee voter profiles in the United States.

1. Excuse-Required: These states require voters to provide the reason for why they cannot vote in person on Election Day (e.g., will be absent from the county, have an illness, or have a physical disability).
2. No Excuse: This is the most common form of absentee voting. In these states, registered voters can vote absentee after they request an absentee ballot.
3. Permanent Absentee: Some states have a permanent absentee voter list. Voters who request to be a permanent absentee voter receive a ballot by mail for every election, without the need to request one for each election.
4. All Vote-by-Mail: In these states, every voter receives a ballot by mail before the election. However, all three of the states that currently have vote-by-mail systems (Colorado, Oregon, and Washington) also provide voters the option to cast a ballot in person.
5. UOCAVA: Members of the uniformed services, their family, and overseas citizens voting from abroad can vote absentee using special procedures outlined in the UOCAVA statute and its amendments.

As seen in Figure 5, a greater percentage of by-mail absentee ballots are cast in the western United States. Colorado, Oregon, and Washington have the highest rates of by-mail voting because of their all vote-by-mail election systems. Colorado, which is the most recent state to transition to all vote-by-mail, provides more in-person options than does Oregon, which adopted vote-by-mail more than 20 years ago. In 2016, Utah began a move to the model used by Colorado and the policy change led to a dramatic increase in the number of ballots cast either early or as absentee. California also continues to be a national leader in by-mail voting, with absentee ballots representing more than 50 percent of the total ballots cast there.

Figure 5. Absentee Voting Rate, $2016^{10}$


Nationally, by-mail voting constituted 23.7 percent of all votes cast in the 2016 election. Approximately 80.1 percent of absentee ballots that were transmitted to voters were returned and processed, with 1.4 percent of transmitted ballots returned as undeliverable and 2 percent reported as spoiled (e.g., the voter returned the ballot and asked for a replacement).

Ninety-nine percent of absentee ballots categorized as "returned and submitted for counting" were ultimately counted in the 2016 election. Table 1 provides information about the reasons for rejecting a ballot as reported by the states and territories. The most common reasons for rejection in 2016 were missing the deadline, the signature on the ballot not matching the signature on the state's records, and the ballot not having a signature. Some of the categories include several reasons for ballot rejection. For example, the category "problem with return envelope" covers reasons such as the envelope was returned but was missing the ballot or multiple ballots were returned in one envelope. The category labeled as "Other" encompasses additional reasons not listed in the EAVS questionnaire, and included responses such as the ballot was not properly notarized, the voter had already cast an absentee ballot, or there was incomplete information on the ballot envelope. In 2016, there were seven states that did not report the reasons why absentee ballots are rejected, which leaves an incomplete picture of why those ballots were not counted.

Table 1. Top Reasons for Rejecting Absentee Ballots

|  | Percentage of ballots returned and submitted for counting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Rejected (total) | 1.0\% |
| Non-matching signature | 27.5\% |
| Ballot not received on time/missed deadline | 23.1\% |
| No voter signature | 20.0\% |
| "Other" reason given | 14.8\% |
| Uncategorized | 5.7\% |
| No witness signature | 3.0\% |
| Problem with return materials (e.g., ballot missing from envelope) | 1.9\% |
| Voter deceased | 1.5\% |
| Voter voted in person | 1.3\% |
| First-time voter without proper identification | 1.1\% |

## UOCAVA Voting

Convenience voting-by-mail absentee voting and in-person early voting-was originally developed to facilitate voting by individuals in the military. ${ }^{11}$ The special needs of members of the uniformed services and overseas citizens remain an area of critical concern in election administration. These individuals are given special voting protections under the UOCAVA and its amendments. ${ }^{12}$ UOCAVA voters are able to vote absentee and are given special considerations as to when their ballots are sent to them and how blank ballots can be transmitted to them. ${ }^{13}$

In 2016, states reported transmitting 930,156 UOCAVA ballots. Six states—California, Florida, Texas, Washington, New York, and Colorado-accounted for nearly half of all UOCAVA ballots transmitted in the United States. As seen in Figure 6, the number of UOCAVA ballots transmitted to voters was similar in 2012 and 2016, but there was a shift between the two elections in the percentage of requests coming from uniformed services voters and overseas citizens. In 2012, there were 63,842 more ballots transmitted to members of the uniformed services than to overseas civilians. In 2016, 109,951 more ballots were transmitted to overseas citizens than to uniformed services voters.

Figure 6. UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted to Voters, 2016


Once a ballot is marked by a voter, it must be returned to the appropriate election office before the state deadline for receiving UOCAVA ballots. This action can be a challenge for some voters, depending on when they receive their ballot, how they are able to return their ballot, and the location from which they are casting their ballot. In the 2016 election, 633,592 UOCAVA ballots were returned. A majority of ballots returned were state ballots that had been transmitted to the voter by the election office. ${ }^{14}$ Of the UOCAVA ballots returned by voters, 512,696 (80.9 percent) were counted.

## Early Voting

The EAC considers early voting to be any in-person voting that occurs prior to Election Day at a physical polling location or vote center. This early voting includes in-person absentee voting. In the 2016 election, early voting made up more than 60 percent of the total votes cast in Arizona, Florida, Montana, North Carolina, Nevada, Oregon, and Texas.

The rates of early voting vary greatly across states because some states do not allow for in-person early voting and, in states with early voting, local jurisdictions within states may differ in number of early voting locations they establish. For the 2016 Federal election, there were, on average, 6.1 early voting sites per 100,000 voters; however, the number of early voting locations per voter may vary based on the size of the jurisdiction and whether multiple locations are warranted based on past voting patterns.

## Election Day Voting

Conducting an election is a complex undertaking. In the United States, Federal elections must be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in every even-numbered year. Election administrators must select polling locations and voting systems for Election Day, and then hire and train poll workers to manage the process. In spite of the increasing popularity of pre-Election Day voting methods, Election Day voting still remains the most popular voting method for citizens of the United States.

## Precincts and Polling Places

For an election, each voter is assigned to a precinct, which is a bounded geographic area where all individuals are eligible to vote for the same candidates and issues on a ballot. Voters are typically also assigned to a polling place, which is the physical location where voting takes place. There can be multiple precincts in a polling place. Among states providing information about Election Day activities in 2016, there were 178,217 precincts and 116,990 physical polling places. Of these polling places, 7.1 percent were election offices and 92.9 percent were other locations, such as schools, community centers, and libraries. For early voting, states reported that election offices were the primary location used; 5,069 election offices were open for early voting compared to 3,547 satellite locations.

## Poll Workers

Election Day voting activities are carried out largely by election poll workers who are trained to work on a single day and are tasked with coordinating an array of activities. The term "poll worker" encompasses many different names across the United States. Poll workers may be referred to as election judges, booth workers, wardens, commissioners, or other similar terms. As defined in this report, "poll worker" refers to the person or persons who do any of the following:

- verify the identity of a voter;
- assist the voter with signing the register, affidavits, or other documents required to cast a ballot;
- assist the voter by providing a ballot or setting up the voting machine; or
- serve other functions as dictated by state law.

Staffing the nation's polling places continues to be a challenge for many jurisdictions: 46.9 percent of responding jurisdictions reported having a somewhat difficult or very difficult time recruiting poll workers, compared with 22.7 percent that reported having a somewhat easy or very easy time. States and territories reported deploying an average of 7.8 poll workers per polling place for Election Day 2016. ${ }^{15}$ This average was similar to that of the last Presidential election in 2012, when jurisdictions reported having 7.4 workers per polling site.

Figure 7. Distribution of Poll Worker Ages


Jurisdictions were asked to report the age of their poll workers across six age categories. As shown in Figure 7, most poll workers are over age 40, with more than half over age 60 and 24 percent aged 71 or older. Young poll workers are relatively rare: only 17.8 percent of poll workers were 40 years old or younger in the 2016 election. A similar age distribution was observed in 2012.

## Voting Technology

Since the 1960s or early 1970s, most ballots in the United States have been counted using computerized tabulators. Direct recording electronic (DRE) voting machines-which often have touchscreens-have been used since the late 1980s. Voting technology continues to advance in the United States. With the enactment of HAVA, Congress appropriated more than \$3.1 billion for EAC to distribute to states to make election administration improvements, including the purchase of voting systems. Now the EAC works to ensure standards are met by certifying election equipment to protect the integrity and security of elections.

Voting technology is a difficult topic to measure in the EAVS because many jurisdictions use multiple systems. For example, a county may employ a scanner for absentee ballots but DRE machines for in-person voting. Polling places may have more than one type of voting system technology in use on Election Day. For this reason, the EAVS survey measures the breadth of voting technology being used across the country, and the wealth of local-level data is of substantial value to researchers.

The 2016 survey collected data on the different voting systems used. The primary three systems used in the states are:

1. DRE Voting Machines: A voting system (push-button or touchscreen) that records votes by means of a ballot display provided with mechanical or electro-optical components activated by the voter and in which voting data are stored in a removable memory component. Many DREs also record voting data on a paper document that the voter can review before officially casting his or her ballot.
2. Optical Scan: These systems count paper ballots by recording the marks in the response fields on the ballot cards using an optical scanner or similar sensor.
3. Hybrid Voting Machines: A hybrid system combines aspects of DREs and optical scan voting. The voting interface for selecting votes is similar to that of a DRE: the voter uses buttons or a touchscreen to select choices, and then the choices are printed on a paper ballot and scanned using an optical scanner. No voting data are stored in the system.

Table 2 shows the number of jurisdictions that reported using various types of voting systems in 2016.

|  | Table 2. Types of Voting Machines Used, 2016 ${ }^{16}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percentage |
|  | 2,745 | $42.5 \%$ |
| Optical Scan | 1,419 | $21.9 \%$ |
| Hybrid | 1,345 | $20.8 \%$ |
| DRE | 992 | $15.3 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |

## Casting and Counting Provisional Ballots

One key provision of HAVA is provisional voting. When an individual declares that he or she is a registered voter in the jurisdiction and is eligible to vote in an election for Federal office, but either (1) the individual's name does not appear on the official list of eligible voters for the polling place, or (2) an election official asserts that the individual is not eligible to vote, the voter can cast a provisional ballot. A provisional ballot is used to record the vote of a provisional voter. Once voted, provisional ballots are kept separate from other ballots and are not tabulated until the eligibility of the voter is confirmed.

When HAVA was enacted, six states—Idaho, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming-were exempt from provisional voting requirements. In 2016, two of these states-Wisconsin and Wyoming-did have provisional voters because the voter did not have correct identification (Wisconsin) or was challenged (Wyoming). The primary way
that states vary in regard to provisional voting is whether they allow a provisional ballot to be counted if the voter casts a ballot in the correct local jurisdiction but not in the voting precinct associated with his or her residence.

In 2016, 2,460,421 provisional ballots were cast nationally and 71.1 percent of these ballots were counted in full or in part. ${ }^{17}$ Four states—Arizona, California, New York, and Ohio-each reported that more than 100,000 provisional ballots were cast in the 2016 election; California had just over 1.3 million provisional ballots cast, more than all other states combined. All four of these states also allowed a ballot that was cast by a voter in the wrong precinct to be counted, either partially or in full. ${ }^{18}$ In similar large states that do not allow provisional ballots to be counted if the voter is not casting it in the correct precinct-such as Florida, Illinois, and Texas-a comparatively smaller number of provisional ballots were cast and a higher percentage of provisional ballots were rejected. In addition to the four states that do not provide for provisional voting, 12 states and territories reported having fewer than 1,000 provisional ballots cast in 2016.

## Endnotes

${ }^{1}$ The Northern Mariana Islands is not included in the EAVS because it did not have representation in Congress at the time HAVA was enacted.
${ }^{2}$ Item-level response rates are difficult to calculate because zero, missing, data not available, and not applicable cannot easily be interpreted. Response rates for each survey section include jurisdictions providing valid, non-zero responses to any questions within a section.
${ }^{3}$ Arizona reported that its same day registrants were likely UOCAVA registrants. Texas reported that its same day registrants were either the result of misreporting or of localities implementing certain policies inappropriately.
${ }^{4}$ The NVRA was fully implemented after the 1994 election in all states. Several states are not covered by the NVRA. North Dakota is exempt because it does not have voter registration. U.S. territories are also not subject to the NVRA, and the states of Idaho, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming are exempt because they had SDR in 1994 and continue to do so.
${ }^{5}$ The Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office, 2015-2016, is available on EAC's website (https://www.eac.gov/voters/national-voter-registration-actstudies/).
${ }^{6}$ North Dakota does not require voters to register but rather keeps a registry of citizens who voted in the past and in that election.
${ }^{7}$ The printing of poll books was completed by the state shipped to local jurisdictions 6.8 percent of the time and 1.5 percent of jurisdictions reported that they used a mix of the two methods; 2.7 percent of jurisdictions reported that information was unavailable.
${ }^{8}$ There is some overlap in the number of Electronic Poll Books used for each of the reported categories, as some jurisdictions use the same Electronic Poll Book for several purposes.
${ }^{9}$ The percentages are based on data reported by 50 states and territories. Alabama, lowa, Utah, and Vermont did not provide information about the number of citizens casting absentee ballots or voting at an early voting center.

10 The absentee voting rate includes all UOCAVA ballots, domestic civilian absentee ballots, and vote-by-mail ballots, as reported in questions F1c, F1d and F1g, respectively.
${ }^{11}$ See, for example, R. Michael Alvarez, Thad E. Hall, and Brian F. Roberts. (2007). Military voting and the law: procedural and technological solutions to the ballot transit problem. Fordham Urban Law Journal, 34, 935.
${ }^{12}$ Since 2004, EAC has gathered data on UOCAVA ballots and voters, pursuant to the statutory reporting obligations in UOCAVA and HAVA. In the 2016 survey, 18 questions sought to gather detailed information on overseas voting. What is presented in this section is explained in more detail in the 2016 Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Survey Observations Report, available at EAC's website, www.eac.gov. Improved data collection of UOCAVA-related information resulted in high response rates in 2016 and more jurisdictions responding overall to this portion of the survey than in previous years. Although gaps remain, better data are gradually becoming available on UOCAVA voting.
${ }^{13}$ The uniformed services are the armed forces-Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force-as well as the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the U.S. Merchant Marine. Uniformed service members, their spouses, and their dependents are, together, referred to as uniformed services voters. Overseas citizens are U.S. citizens living outside of the United States who are not uniformed services voters and are also protected by UOCAVA.
${ }^{14}$ UOCAVA voters can also cast a Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot (FWAB). Information about those ballots is discussed in some detail in the UOCAVA EAVS report.
${ }^{15}$ Only Oregon and Massachusetts did not provide information about number of poll workers, and lowa did not report number of physical polling places for the 2016 Presidential Election.
${ }^{16}$ Some jurisdictions may have used more than one voting system, thus, the percentages may have some degree of overlap between jurisdictions.
${ }^{17}$ Of the $1,748,883$ provisional ballots that were counted, $87.7 \%$ of them were counted in full.
${ }^{18}$ Ballots are typically counted for all races for which the voter would have been eligible.

## Overview Appendix A: Overview Tables

| Overview Table 1: Voter Turnout |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Voter Turnout | Total CVAP | Turnout as Pct. CVAP | Total Registration | Turnout as Pct. Registration |
| Alabama | 2,137,452 | 3,620,994 | 59.03 | 3,333,946 | 64.11 |
| Alaska | 323,288 | 523,747 | 61.73 | 587,303 | 55.05 |
| Arizona | 2,722,660 | 4,526,594 | 60.15 | 4,080,680 | 66.72 |
| Arkansas | 1,048,513 | 2,164,083 | 48.45 | 1,765,513 | 59.39 |
| California | 14,610,494 | 24,280,349 | 60.17 | 24,486,638 | 59.67 |
| Colorado | 2,884,199 | 3,750,953 | 76.89 | 3,840,303 | 75.1 |
| Connecticut | 1,675,955 | 2,574,178 | 65.11 | 2,331,684 | 71.88 |
| Delaware | 448,217 | 681,606 | 65.76 | 675,663 | 66.34 |
| District of Columbia | 311,841 | 485,116 | 64.28 | 493,287 | 63.22 |
| Florida | 9,613,669 | 13,933,052 | 69 | 13,505,571 | 71.18 |
| Georgia | 4,147,161 | 6,978,660 | 59.43 | 6,657,621 | 62.29 |
| Guam | 35,854 | 0 | . | 51,720 | 69.32 |
| Hawaii | 437,697 | 1,001,729 | 43.69 | 751,483 | 58.24 |
| Idaho | 710,495 | 1,130,550 | 62.85 | 936,529 | 75.86 |
| Illinois | 5,562,009 | 8,979,999 | 61.94 | 8,843,038 | 62.9 |
| Indiana | 2,831,540 | 4,801,113 | 58.98 | 4,839,038 | 58.51 |
| Iowa | 1,581,371 | 2,285,126 | 69.2 | 2,222,380 | 71.16 |
| Kansas | 1,223,491 | 2,053,919 | 59.57 | 1,785,834 | 68.51 |
| Kentucky | 1,949,254 | 3,297,108 | 59.12 | 3,306,120 | 58.96 |
| Louisiana | 2,049,802 | 3,410,634 | 60.1 | 3,058,741 | 67.01 |
| Maine | 771,892 | 1,048,274 | 73.63 | 1,065,100 | 72.47 |
| Maryland | 2,807,326 | 4,182,241 | 67.12 | 3,900,090 | 71.98 |
| Massachusetts | 3,378,801 | 4,850,598 | 69.66 | 4,534,974 | 74.51 |
| Michigan | 4,874,619 | 7,380,136 | 66.05 | 7,514,055 | 64.87 |
| Minnesota | 2,973,744 | 3,950,807 | 75.27 | 3,473,972 | 85.6 |
| Mississippi | 1,209,357 | 2,210,424 | 54.71 | 2,072,395 | 58.36 |
| Missouri | 2,973,855 | 4,525,035 | 65.72 | 4,215,860 | 70.54 |
| Montana | 516,901 | 781,250 | 66.16 | 694,370 | 74.44 |
| Nebraska | 869,815 | 1,333,860 | 65.21 | 1,211,101 | 71.82 |
| Nevada | 1,128,492 | 1,863,799 | 60.55 | 1,678,883 | 67.22 |
| New Hampshire | 757,669 | 1,020,130 | 74.27 | 988,398 | 76.66 |
| New Jersey | 3,957,303 | 6,053,893 | 65.37 | 5,751,090 | 68.81 |
| New Mexico | 804,073 | 1,457,632 | 55.16 | 1,289,420 | 62.36 |
| New York | 7,793,078 | 13,531,404 | 57.59 | 16,200,892 | 48.1 |
| North Carolina | 4,690,195 | 7,107,998 | 65.98 | 6,924,469 | 67.73 |


| Overview Table 1: Voter Turnout |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Voter Turnout | Total CVAP | Turnout as Pct. CVAP | Total Registration | $\qquad$ |
| North Dakota | 349,945 | 546,486 | 64.04 | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 5,607,641 | 8,709,050 | 64.39 | 7,861,025 | 71.33 |
| Oklahoma | 1,465,505 | 2,768,561 | 52.93 | 2,157,450 | 67.93 |
| Oregon | 2,051,452 | 2,867,670 | 71.54 | 2,553,810 | 80.33 |
| Pennsylvania | 6,223,150 | 9,710,416 | 64.09 | 8,722,975 | 71.34 |
| Puerto Rico | 1,589,991 | 0 |  | 2,867,558 | 55.45 |
| Rhode Island | 469,547 | 776,565 | 60.46 | 754,065 | 62.27 |
| South Carolina | 2,124,952 | 3,566,508 | 59.58 | 3,157,027 | 67.31 |
| South Dakota | 372,988 | 621,461 | 60.02 | 595,322 | 62.65 |
| Tennessee | 2,545,271 | 4,828,366 | 52.72 | 4,110,318 | 61.92 |
| Texas | 8,701,152 | 16,864,962 | 51.59 | 14,382,387 | 60.5 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 20,967 | 0 |  | 46,076 | 45.51 |
| Utah | 1,114,567 | 1,868,008 | 59.67 | 1,577,069 | 70.67 |
| Vermont | 323,623 | 493,124 | 65.63 | 472,289 | 68.52 |
| Virginia | 3,996,302 | 5,953,612 | 67.12 | 5,604,106 | 71.31 |
| Washington | 3,363,452 | 4,937,212 | 68.12 | 4,872,385 | 69.03 |
| West Virginia | 732,362 | 1,455,848 | 50.3 | 1,254,768 | 58.37 |
| Wisconsin | 2,993,000 | 4,294,321 | 69.7 | 3,768,373 | 79.42 |
| Wyoming | 256,553 | 430,026 | 59.66 | 284,203 | 90.27 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 140,114,503 | 222,469,187 | 62.98 | 214,109,367 | 65.44 |

Overview Table 1 Calculation Notes
(1) Total Voter Turnout uses question F1a
(2) Total CVAP uses estimates of the Citizen Voting Age Population from the U.S. Census Bureau
(3) Percentage of CVAP that voted in the past election uses question F1a divided by the CVAP estimate
(4) Total Registration uses question A1a
(5) Percentage of total Registrants that Voted in Election uses question F1a divided by question A1a

Overview Table 1 Data Notes
General note: CVAP (Citizen Voting Age Population) and calculations using CVAP are not available for U.S. territories. CVAP was taken from the U.S. Census Bureau.
Illinois: did not provide the total turnout (item F1a). The total turnout was re-recorded using the sum of items F1b to F1j (i.e., turnout categories for which the state provided data)
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.

| Overview Table 2: Absentee Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Voter Turnout | Total Ballots Transmitted | Total Ballots Returned | Counted |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Pct. Returned | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Total | Pct. |
| Alabama | 2,137,452 | 98,474 | 88,601 | 87,553 | 98.82 | 0 | 0 | 1,048 | 1.18 |
| Alaska | 323,288 | 31,817 | 27,626 | 26,750 | 96.83 | 876 | 2.75 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Arizona | 2,722,660 | 2,478,063 | 2,017,722 | 1,991,683 | 98.71 | 10,769 | 0.43 | 15,270 | 0.76 |
| Arkansas | 1,048,513 | 29,902 | 27,525 | 26,655 | 96.84 | 1,614 | 5.4 | -744 | -2.70 |
| California | 14,610,494 | 12,018,267 | 8,511,992 | 8,453,683 | 99.31 | 58,309 | 0.49 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Colorado | 2,884,199 | 3,411,107 | 2,654,993 | 2,631,744 | 99.12 | 23,249 | 0.68 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 1,675,955 | 129,480 | 132,012 | 129,480 | 98.08 | 2,532 | 1.96 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Delaware | 448,217 | 15,924 | 14,025 | 13,809 | 98.46 | 216 | 1.36 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 311,841 | 21,362 | 16,625 | 16,592 | 99.8 | 33 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Florida | 9,613,669 | 3,421,930 | 2,679,049 | 2,657,064 | 99.18 | 21,973 | 0.64 | 12 | 0.00 |
| Georgia | 4,147,161 | 236,925 | 213,033 | 199,356 | 93.58 | 13,677 | 5.77 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 35,854 | 1,634 | 1,527 | 1,508 | 98.76 | 19 | 1.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Hawaii | 437,697 | 218,487 | 190,553 | 189,225 | 99.3 | 1,244 | 0.57 | 84 | 0.04 |
| Idaho | 710,495 | 207,409 | 201,256 | 200,380 | 99.56 | 876 | 0.42 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Illinois | 5,562,009 | 428,748 | 377,551 | 371,557 | 98.41 | 5,994 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Indiana | 2,831,540 | 946,408 | 943,924 | 923,455 | 97.83 | 2,095 | 0.22 | 18,374 | 1.95 |
| lowa | 1,581,371 | 671,415 | 650,551 | 646,313 | 99.35 | 4,238 | 0.63 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Kansas | 1,223,491 | 196,910 | 179,557 | 177,701 | 98.97 | 4,361 | 2.21 | -2,505 | -1.40 |
| Kentucky | 1,949,254 | 42,519 | 38,112 | 35,967 | 94.37 | 2,145 | 5.04 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Louisiana | 2,049,802 | 76,120 | 59,747 | 57,476 | 96.2 | 2,271 | 2.98 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maine | 771,892 | 260,033 | 254,153 | 251,701 | 99.04 | 2,452 | 0.94 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 2,807,326 | 206,063 | 160,508 | 158,120 | 98.51 | 2,388 | 1.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Massachusetts | 3,378,801 | 174,655 | 155,894 | 150,742 | 96.7 | 5,152 | 2.95 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Overview Table 2: Absentee Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Counted |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  | ut | Transmitted | Ballots Returned | Total | Pct. Returned | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Total | Pct. |
| Michigan | 4,874,619 | 1,342,421 | 1,260,218 | 1,253,980 | 99.5 | 6,171 | 0.46 | 67 | 0.01 |
| Minnesota | 2,973,744 | 726,026 | 671,261 | 665,180 | 99.09 | 6,081 | 0.84 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mississippi | 1,209,357 | 110,148 | 103,606 | 102,025 | 98.47 | 1,581 | 1.44 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Missouri | 2,973,855 | 293,076 | 279,188 | 273,336 | 97.9 | 5,849 | 2 | 3 | 0.00 |
| Montana | 516,901 | 351,575 | 333,666 | 332,541 | 99.66 | 1,125 | 0.32 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nebraska | 869,815 | 248,424 | 238,660 | 233,889 | 98 | 2,695 | 1.08 | 2,076 | 0.87 |
| Nevada | 1,128,492 | 86,991 | 73,425 | 72,248 | 98.4 | 1,177 | 1.35 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Hampshire | 757,669 | 74,547 | 71,939 | 70,376 | 97.83 | 1,563 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Jersey | 3,957,303 | 411,574 | 355,457 | 344,897 | 97.03 | 9,957 | 2.42 | 603 | 0.17 |
| New Mexico | 804,073 | 69,529 | 61,287 | 47,429 | 77.39 | 95 | 0.14 | 13,763 | 22.46 |
| New York | 7,793,078 | 495,520 | 402,151 | 364,747 | 90.7 | 22,849 | 4.61 | 14,555 | 3.62 |
| North Carolina | 4,690,195 | 212,489 | 179,263 | 174,402 | 97.29 | 4,861 | 2.29 | 0 | 0.00 |
| North Dakota | 349,945 | 86,442 | 82,148 | 81,536 | 99.25 | 611 | 0.71 | 1 | 0.00 |
| Ohio | 5,607,641 | 1,286,430 | 1,206,416 | 1,193,227 | 98.91 | 10,189 | 0.79 | 3,000 | 0.25 |
| Oklahoma | 1,465,505 | 122,864 | 101,905 | 98,381 | 96.54 | 2,965 | 2.41 | 559 | 0.55 |
| Oregon | 2,051,452 | 2,553,810 | 2,051,452 | 2,033,878 | 99.14 | 17,574 | 0.69 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 6,223,150 | 292,191 | 266,208 | 262,877 | 98.75 | 2,534 | 0.87 | 797 | 0.30 |
| Puerto Rico | 1,589,991 | 1,543 | 818 | 818 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Rhode Island | 469,547 | 42,687 | 39,727 | 38,567 | 97.08 | 1,060 | 2.48 | 100 | 0.25 |
| South Carolina | 2,124,952 | 508,508 | 497,436 | 494,529 | 99.42 | 2,907 | 0.57 | 0 | 0.00 |
| South Dakota | 372,988 | 107,128 | 106,415 | 106,055 | 99.66 | 360 | 0.34 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Tennessee | 2,545,271 | 59,388 | 53,903 | 53,310 | 98.9 | 593 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Texas | 8,701,152 | 520,027 | 468,150 | 449,258 | 95.96 | 8,177 | 1.57 | 10,715 | 2.29 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 20,967 | 204 | 143 | 143 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Overview Table 2: Absentee Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Voter Turnout | Total Ballots Transmitted | Total Ballots Returned | Counted |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Pct. Returned | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Total | Pct. |
| Utah | 1,114,567 | 1,090,192 | 772,888 | 765,886 | 99.09 | 7,002 | 0.64 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Vermont | 323,623 | 96,281 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Virginia | 3,996,302 | 570,144 | 538,711 | 535,563 | 99.42 | 3,148 | 0.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 3,363,452 | 4,312,805 | 3,333,260 | 3,300,241 | 99.01 | 30,312 | 0.7 | 2,707 | 0.08 |
| West Virginia | 732,362 | 13,761 | 12,558 | 16,373 | 130.38 | 341 | 2.48 | -4,156 | -33.09 |
| Wisconsin | 2,993,000 | 158,846 | 139,988 | 138,542 | 98.97 | 284 | 0.18 | 1,162 | 0.83 |
| Wyoming | 256,553 | 82,303 | 79,667 | 79,463 | 99.74 | 184 | 0.22 | 20 | 0.03 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 140,114,502 | 41,651,526 | 33,378,450 | 32,982,211 | 98.81 | 318,728 | 0.77 | 77,511 | 0.23 |

Overview Table 2 Calculation Notes
(1) Total Voter Turnout uses question F1
(2) Total Number of Ballots Transmitted uses question C1a
(3) Total Number of Ballots Returned uses question C1b
(4) Ballots Counted, Total uses question C4a
(5) Ballots Counted, Pct uses question C4a divided by question C1b
(6) Ballots Rejected, Total uses question C4b
(7) Ballots Rejected, Pct uses question C4b divided by question C1a
(8) Other, Total uses question C1b minus the sum of questions C4a and C4b
(9) Other, Pct uses question C1b minus the sum of question C4a and C4b, all divided by question C1b

Overview Table 2 Data Notes sum of counted and rejected absentee ballots (C4a and C4b)
Connecticut: misinterpreted the item "Returned for counting" (C1b) and added only those ballots that were counted (item C4a). Item C1b was re-recorded using the of returned absentee ballots reported by the state.
absentee ballots by that county (items C4a to C4d).
Hawaii: Hawaii County did not report the number of absentee ballots returned by voters (item C1b). This was re-recorded using the sum of counted and rejected
Texas: Hidalgo County and Dallas County either not
by voters (item C1b). This was re-recorded using the sum of counted and rejected absentee ballots by those counties (items C4a to C4d).
Vermont: did not provide data about absentee ballots returned.
West Virginia: all jurisdictions reported more absentee ballots counted (item C 4 a ) than received back (item C 1 b ).

| Overview Table 3: Provisional Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Ballots Submitted | Counted Full Ballot |  | Counted Partial Ballot |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Alabama | 13,088 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,008 | 45.9 | 7,080 | 54.10 |
| Alaska | 19,822 | 5,277 | 26.62 | 14,274 | 72.01 | 271 | 1.37 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Arizona | 102,510 | 78,532 | 76.61 | 13 | 0.01 | 23,959 | 23.37 | 6 | 0.01 |
| Arkansas | 4,303 | 1,093 | 25.4 | 9 | 0.21 | 3,199 | 74.34 | 2 | 0.05 |
| California | 1,307,190 | 898,441 | 68.73 | 151,783 | 11.61 | 193,534 | 14.81 | 63,432 | 4.85 |
| Colorado | 5,910 | 4,126 | 69.81 | 301 | 5.09 | 1,483 | 25.09 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 66 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 45.45 | 36 | 54.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Delaware | 296 | 23 | 7.77 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 92.23 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 3,447 | 1,990 | 57.73 | 0 | 0 | 1,457 | 42.27 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Florida | 24,460 | 10,998 | 44.96 | 0 | 0 | 13,461 | 55.03 | 1 | 0.00 |
| Georgia | 16,739 | 7,592 | 45.36 | 0 | 0 | 9,147 | 54.64 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 121 | 12 | 9.92 | 16 | 13.22 | 93 | 76.86 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Hawaii | 845 | 114 | 13.49 | 0 | 0 | 711 | 84.14 | 20 | 2.37 |
| Idaho | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Illinois | 26,360 | 14,090 | 53.45 | 0 | 0 | 12,270 | 46.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Indiana | 3,033 | 644 | 21.23 | 0 | 0 | 2,389 | 78.77 | 0 | 0.00 |
| lowa | 2,553 | 1,871 | 73.29 | 0 | 0 | 682 | 26.71 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Kansas | 40,872 | 0 | 0 | 22,726 | 55.6 | 13,717 | 33.56 | 4,429 | 10.84 |
| Kentucky | 291 | 58 | 19.93 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 80.07 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Louisiana | 4,938 | 1,284 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 3,654 | 74 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maine | 193 | 193 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 78,660 | 51,576 | 65.57 | 17,661 | 22.45 | 9,423 | 11.98 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Massachusetts | 7,349 | 2,199 | 29.92 | 0 | 0 | 5,145 | 70.01 | 5 | 0.07 |
| Michigan | 1,891 | 338 | 17.87 | 0 | 0 | 1,553 | 82.13 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Overview Table 3: Provisional Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Ballots Submitted | Counted Full Ballot |  | Counted Partial Ballot |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Minnesota | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Mississippi | 21,493 | 16,139 | 75.09 | 0 | 0 | 5,354 | 24.91 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Missouri | 5,511 | 1,701 | 30.87 | 0 | 0 | 3,803 | 69.01 | 7 | 0.13 |
| Montana | 7,615 | 7,301 | 95.88 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 4.12 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nebraska | 16,212 | 12,350 | 76.18 | 0 | 0 | 3,860 | 23.81 | 2 | 0.01 |
| Nevada | 6,857 | 2,324 | 33.89 | 0 | 0 | 4,533 | 66.11 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| New Jersey | 56,091 | 45,503 | 81.12 | 0 | 0 | 10,588 | 18.88 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Mexico | 5,607 | 2,462 | 43.91 | 0 | 0 | 3,162 | 56.39 | -17 | -0.30 |
| New York | 266,369 | 135,368 | 50.82 | 0 | 0 | 120,778 | 45.34 | 10,223 | 3.84 |
| North Carolina | 60,643 | 21,717 | 35.81 | 5,170 | 8.53 | 33,756 | 55.66 | 0 | 0.00 |
| North Dakota | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 154,965 | 130,533 | 84.23 | 1,454 | 0.94 | 22,978 | 14.83 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oklahoma | 7,374 | 1,954 | 26.5 | 1 | 0.01 | 5,419 | 73.49 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oregon | 136 | 71 | 52.21 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 47.79 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 26,451 | 7,994 | 30.22 | 0 | 0 | 9,392 | 35.51 | 9,065 | 34.27 |
| Puerto Rico | 8,719 | 6,589 | 75.57 | 233 | 2.67 | 1,851 | 21.23 | 46 | 0.53 |
| Rhode Island | 3,963 | 1,313 | 33.13 | 734 | 18.52 | 1,916 | 48.35 | 0 | 0.00 |
| South Carolina | 10,100 | 5,261 | 52.09 | 0 | 0 | 4,835 | 47.87 | 4 | 0.04 |
| South Dakota | 379 | 50 | 13.19 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 44.85 | 159 | 41.95 |
| Tennessee | 11,688 | 3,272 | 27.99 | 0 | 0 | 8,416 | 72.01 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Texas | 67,273 | 12,305 | 18.29 | 30 | 0.04 | 54,850 | 81.53 | 88 | 0.13 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 303 | 149 | 49.17 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 17.82 | 100 | 33.00 |
| Utah | 34,360 | 30,281 | 88.13 | 0 | 0 | 4,079 | 11.87 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Overview Table 3: Provisional Voting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Ballots Submitted | Counted Full Ballot |  | Counted Partial Ballot |  | Rejected |  | Other |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Vermont | 11 | 2 | 18.18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27.27 | 6 | 54.55 |
| Virginia | 13,100 | 3,534 | 26.98 | 0 | 0 | 9,566 | 73.02 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 6,179 | 3,358 | 54.35 | 0 | 0 | 1,653 | 26.75 | 1,168 | 18.90 |
| West Virginia | 3,285 | 2,294 | 69.83 | 0 | 0 | 807 | 24.57 | 184 | 5.60 |
| Wisconsin | 752 | 152 | 20.21 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 79.79 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Wyoming | 48 | 20 | 41.67 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 58.33 | 0 | 0.00 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 2,460,421 | 1,534,448 | 62.37 | 214,435 | 8.72 | 615,528 | 25.02 | 96,010 | 3.90 |

Overview Table 3 Calculation Notes
(1) Total Ballots Submitted uses question E1a (2) \% Counted Full Ballot, Total uses question E1b
(3) \% Counted Full Ballot, Pct uses question E1b divided by question E1a
(4) \% Counted Part Ballot, Total uses question E1c
(5) \% Counted Part Ballot, Pct uses question E1c divided by question E1a
(6) \% Rejected Ballot, Total uses question E1d
(7) \% Rejected Ballot, Pct uses question E1d divided by question E1a
(8) \% Other, Total uses question E1a minus the sum of question E1b, E1c and E1d
(9) \% Other, Pct uses question E1a minus the sum of question E1b, E1c and E1d, all divided by question E1a

Overview Table 3 Data Notes
Alabama: did not report number of partially or fully counted provisional ballots (items E1b and E1c) Idaho: did not provide being NVRA exempt

Kansas: reported ballots fully counted and partially counted together in the category "Counted Partial Ballot" (item E1c).
Minnesota: did not provide information about provisional voting. This state reported: "Minnesota does not have provisional ballots"
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
New Hampshire: did not provide information about provisional voting.




| Overview Table 4: Voting Technology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Voting Equipment, All Types | DRE |  | Hybrid DRE/Optical Scan |  | Optical or Digital Scan |  | Other |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Vermont | 1,122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 18.72 | 912 | 81.28 |
| Virginia | 13,593 | 1,422 | 10.46 | 0 | 0 | 12,171 | 89.54 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 141 | 27 | 19.15 | 43 | 30.5 | 71 | 50.35 | 0 | 0.00 |
| West Virginia | 5,323 | 3,647 | 68.51 | 554 | 10.41 | 1,103 | 20.72 | 19 | 0.36 |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Wyoming | 1,156 | 302 | 26.12 | 363 | 31.4 | 491 | 42.47 | 0 | 0.00 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 567,880 | 225,381 | 39.69 | 37,373 | 6.58 | 297,712 | 52.43 | 7,414 | 1.31 |

Overview Table 4 Calculation Notes
(1) Sum of All Voting Equipment uses the sum of questions: F7a_Number, F7b_Number, F7c_Number, F7d_NumCounters, F7d_NumBooths, F7e_NumCounters, F7e_NumBooths, F7f_Number, F7g_Number, F7h_Number and F7i_Number; this sum will be referred to as the "grand sum" in the following notes.
(2) DRE, Total uses the sum of questions F7a_Number and F7b_Number
(3) DRE, Pct uses the sum of questions F7a_Number and F7b_Number divided by the grand sum
(4) Hybrid of DRE / Optical Scan, Total uses question F7c_Number
(5) Hybrid of DRE / Optical Scan, Pct uses question F7c_Number divided by the grand sum
(6) Optical or Digital Scan, Total uses the sum of question F7d_NumCounters and F7d_NumBooths
(7) Optical or Digital Scan, Pct uses the sum of question F7d_NumCounters and F7d_NumBooths divided by the grand sum
Overview Table 4 Data Notes
General note: the category "Other" includes all other voting systems not listed in the other columns, such as: punch card, lever and hand-counted paper ballots.
Alabama, Illinois, lowa, Oregon, Utah and Wisconsin: did not report information about voting technology used in the Presidential Election.

REGISTRATION ACT (NVRA)
SURVEY FINDINGS


## Introduction

Voter registration is perhaps the most complex aspect of election administration. Once the rules have been established regarding who is eligible to vote-in the United States, this is typically all citizens who are ages 18 and older who are not convicted felons or currently incarcerated-there has to be a process for ensuring that only eligible individuals vote and that each person only votes once. Voter registration is the process by which a person's eligibility to vote is confirmed and his or her place of residence is established. Voter registration also serves to assign each voter to a precinct-a geographic area where all individuals are eligible to vote for the same candidates and issues on a ballot-so that he or she receives the correct ballot in the election. The voter registration system tracks each voter's electoral participation so that an individual can be given credit for voting in an election, which ensures each person casts only one ballot per election.

## Figure 1: The Registration Process

The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA)


The primary Federal law governing voter registration in the United States is the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA). In the NVRA, Congress provides a clear statement regarding the importance of voter registration. Specifically, Congress finds that:
(1) the right of citizens of the United States to vote is a fundamental right;
(2) it is the duty of the Federal, State, and local governments to promote the exercise of that right; and
(3) discriminatory and unfair registration laws and procedures can have a direct and damaging effect on voter participation in elections for Federal office and disproportionately harm voter participation by various groups, including racial minorities. ${ }^{1}$

The primary purposes of the NVRA are:
(1) to establish procedures that will increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in elections for Federal office;
(2) to make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to implement [the NVRA] in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as voters in elections for Federal office;
(3) to protect the integrity of the electoral process; and
(4) to ensure that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained.

The NVRA was fully implemented after the 1994 election in all states. Several states are not covered by the NVRA. North Dakota is exempt because it does not have voter registration. U.S. territories are also not subject to the NVRA, and the states of Idaho, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming are exempt because they had Same Day Registration (SDR) in 1994 and continue to make this option available.

## The Registration Process

The NVRA's first purpose is to expand opportunities for voters to register by creating more uniform processes for voter registration and designating more places as voter registration agencies. The NVRA requires states and territories to allow people to register to vote through four venues: (1) at the state department of motor vehicles (DMV) when a person obtains or renews his or her driver's license, (2) through the mail, using a standard registration form, (3) at all offices for state public assistance agencies, and (4) at all offices or agencies that provide services to people with disabilities. In addition, states can, at their discretion, designate other offices-libraries, public schools and universities-as voter registration agencies.

When a person registers to vote, the state checks the registration form to ensure that the individual is eligible to vote. This process typically involves requiring the person to demonstrate proof of identity and proof of residency. Once the person proves his or her eligibility, he or she is added to the voter registration rolls.

Every person with a valid registration is considered an active, registered voter. However, at times, a question arises as to whether a person is still living at the residence where he or she is registered to vote. When such situations arise, the state or local election office will send the registrant a confirmation of address notice. In many states, if the person fails to return the form or the form is returned undeliverable, he or she is placed on a list of inactive voters.

Inactive voters are still part of the voter registration rolls and they are allowed to vote in most jurisdictions. ${ }^{2}$ However, before they can vote, inactive voters are typically required to show approved documentation of their eligibility, most commonly proof that they still reside at the address where they registered to vote. In some cases, inactive voters may have to cast a provisional ballot when their eligibility cannot be established at the polls on Election Day.

The NVRA also requires list maintenance. For example, if a registrant fails to return the confirmation notice and does not vote in two subsequent Federal elections, he or she might be removed from the registration rolls of a particular jurisdiction. In addition, registrants can be removed for other reasons like death, request by the registrant to be removed from registration rolls, or due to criminal conviction or mental incompetence as provided by a state's laws.

## Registration Rates

The NVRA requires each state and territory to report its number of "registered and eligible" voters, as well as the total active and inactive voters, to the EAC. The way in which the number of registered voters is reported differs by state. Most states report the number of "registered and eligible" voters as the sum of active and inactive voters. Some states consider only active voters as registered but may separately provide information about voters on the inactive list. In some states, local jurisdictions within a state differ in how they report registration. These distinctions are important to recognize when interpreting EAVS data on voter registration.

For the 2016 Presidential election, states reported that 214,109,360 citizens were registered to vote. ${ }^{3}$ This represents a 10.6 percent increase in registered voters compared with the 2012 Presidential election. Nationally, 86.7 percent of all registrants are considered active voters, and 8.7 percent are on an inactive voter registration list. ${ }^{4}$

Figure 2. Percentage of Active and Inactive Voters per State ${ }^{5}$


## Sources of Registrations

Between 2014 and 2016, U.S. states and territories reported receiving a total of 77,516,592 registration applications. ${ }^{6}$ NVRA requires states to provide several options for registering to vote. As reported in Table 1, the DMV was the most common source of registration for the 2016 Presidential election. The four major sources of registration-DMV, mail, in person, and online-accounted for nearly 80 percent of registrations. The remaining applications were from sources such as registration drives by political parties ( 3.4 percent), agencies designated by each particular state ( 2.1 percent), and Armed Forces recruiting offices ( 0.1 percent), among others.

| Table 1. Registrations Received by Source of Registration |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Registrations Received |  |
| Department of Motor Vehicles | $25,373,246$ | Percentage |
| Online | $13,485,127$ | $32.7 \%$ |
| Mail, Email, Fax | $13,407,280$ | $17.4 \%$ |
| Other | $11,827,506$ | $17.3 \%$ |
| In Person at Local Election <br> Office | $9,424,298$ | $15.3 \%$ |

When comparing the modes that Americans used to register for the 2016 Presidential election with those used in previous election years, a few differences stand out. First, internet applications constituted only 6.5 percent total registrations in the 2014 election, but accounted for 17.4 percent of registrations in the 2016 Presidential election. Since its inception, the act of registering to vote online has grown in popularity as it has been adopted by more states. The DMV still receives the most registration applications ( 32.7 percent), but other registration methods, like mail and in person registration, have declined in use since the 2012 Presidential election. Figure 3 shows the percentage of registration forms from various sources for the previous three Federal election cycles.

A good example of a state whose registration numbers track the national registration trend is Kansas (NVRA Table 2a). The largest percentages of registration forms came from the DMV (39.2 percent), mail (14 percent), in person (11.6 percent), and the internet (19.9 percent, nearly double the previous Presidential election).

Figure 3. Percentage of Registrations Received by Source and Year


Although Kansas is an example of a typical state when it comes to voter registration, several states have very different patterns of registration. For example, Mississippi reported receiving most of its registrations in person (44.7 percent) and by mail ( 32.5 percent), with DMV applications representing just 11.1 percent of the total (less than half the national average). In Nevada (24.3 percent) and Colorado (12.6 percent), the rate of registrations coming from voter registration drives and political parties was more than three times higher than the national average ( 3.4 percent). The data in these two states suggest that political parties and other organizations are more active in collecting registration applications from citizens, reducing the percentage of registrations coming from other popular application methods, like mail or in person registration.

## Voter Registration Forms Processed

There are several reasons why citizens decide to complete the registration process, such as registering for the first time in a jurisdiction, change of address, change of name, or change of party affiliation. States and territories were asked to report on the types of applications they processed from each of the available sources during the 2016 election cycle (Figure 4). These data show that only 37.3 percent of voter registration forms processed nationally were new, valid registrations. Most valid registrations that are processed are changes to existing registrations; for example, changes of address within a jurisdiction (39.7 percent). In 2016, cross-jurisdiction changes of address accounted for 5.9 percent of applications. Some states also allowed citizens who turned 18 years old before or on Election Day to pre-register so that they could vote in the general election, but these pre-registrations only accounted for 0.5 percent of registrations in the 33 states and territories that reported having this type of
registration. Combined, duplicate and invalid registrations constituted 10.3 percent of the total applications received.

Figure 4. Percentage of Applications by Outcome


## Valid, Rejected, and Duplicate Registration Forms

Although millions of registration forms are received each year, not all of them are accepted. Once the registration applications are received, the election officials from the corresponding jurisdiction examine the application and decide whether or not the citizen meets eligibility requirements. States and territories reported processing 77,516,596 applications, 83.4 percent of which were accepted by election officials. ${ }^{7}$

Almost 8 million registration applications for the 2016 Presidential election were not accepted as valid ( 10.3 percent of the total registrations received). ${ }^{8}$ This is a decrease of about 700,000 compared to the 2012 Presidential election, when 13.9 percent of the total registration applications were not valid. The reasons to categorize a registration as not valid were that either (1) the registration was a duplicate (registrant already submitted an application or was registered in the jurisdiction), or (2) the registration was rejected by the election officials for not complying with eligibility rules. ${ }^{9}$

Figure 5 shows the registration sources that accounted for the most rejected and duplicate registrations in 2016. Motor vehicle offices were responsible for 32.1 percent of all new valid registrations and only 14.9 percent of invalid registrations. However, one-third of all duplicate registrations originate from a DMV. The high percentage of duplicate registrations originating from a DMV suggests that many are not able to see in real time if a person is already registered to vote at a given address and are processing applications for individuals who are already registered in a jurisdiction.

Figure 5. Source of Registration Applications by Outcome


Online voter registration also has a low percentage of invalid registrations (8.2 percent) compared to its percentage of valid registrations (15 percent). However, as is the case with state DMVs, many online voter registration systems do not seem to inform registered voters that they already have a valid registration. In person and mail registrations show similar rates between valid, invalid, and duplicate registration processed. Sources of registration categorized as "Other" accounted for about 10 percent of the total new valid registrations and for one-quarter of the invalid registrations in 2016. However, "Other" encompassed several sources and modes of registration, which showed differing rates of invalid registrations (see NVRA Table 2d).

It is important to note that each state has its own particularities related to voter registration rejection and duplicate rates, making it difficult to assess national-level rates by registration source. In some cases, a state did not use a certain mode of registration (e.g., online registration) in 2016. In other cases, a state did not classify the source of duplicate and rejected applications, making it difficult to track trends in invalid or duplicate registration applications. ${ }^{10}$

Figure 6. Percentage of Rejected and Duplicate Registrations


Figure 6 provides information about the percentage of rejected and duplicate registrations in each state. It shows that South Dakota ( 29.9 percent) and Kentucky (32 percent) reported the highest percentages of duplicate and rejected registrations. Less than one percent of voter registrations in Missouri and Maryland were rejected or had duplicates, and Arkansas and New Hampshire reported that less than 0.2 percent of the registrations processed were duplicates.

## List Maintenance

One of the NVRA's goals is to ensure that voter registration lists are accurate and current. In order to facilitate this maintenance, NVRA requires that any change of address submitted to a motor vehicle driver's license agency serve as notification of a change of address for voter registration, unless the individual indicates that the change is not for voter registration purposes. ${ }^{11}$ The law also requires states and territories to conduct a uniform and nondiscriminatory general program to remove the names of ineligible voters. ${ }^{12}$ However, states and territories have considerable freedom to choose when, where, and how these functions are performed.

According to Section 8 of the NVRA, States can only remove registrants from rolls for the following reasons:

- upon the death of the registrant;
- upon the registrant's written confirmation that his or her address has changed to a location outside the registrar's jurisdiction;
- on the registrant's failure to respond to certain confirmation mailings along with failure to appear to vote in two consecutive Federal general elections subsequent to the mailing;
- on the request of the registrant;
- for mental incapacity of the registrant, as provided for in state law; and
- on criminal conviction of the registrant, as provided for in state law.


## Confirmation Notices

A central part of voter registration list maintenance is the use of confirmation notices. When a state or territory has evidence that a registrant has moved outside the registrar's jurisdiction, the state or local election office is required to start a process of address confirmation. This process begins by sending a confirmation notice by mail to the individual, which contains a postage-prepaid and pre-addressed return card so that the registrant can confirm his or her current address. If the registrant fails to return the completed confirmation notice before the registration deadline, the person can be asked to provide proof of address when attempting to vote in a Federal election. If the registrant does not to vote in either of the two Federal elections after failing to return the confirmation notice, this person can be removed from the registration rolls.

The 47 states and territories that responded to this section of the EAVS survey reported sending a total of 19,058,066 confirmation notices to registrants during the 2016 election cycle (NVRA Table 4a). ${ }^{13}$ This represents a 1.5 million increase compared to the number of confirmation notices sent in the period leading to the 2012 Presidential election. However, only 41 states reported data about this matter in 2012.

The response rate by registrants to confirmation notices nationwide was 12.8 percent. Alabama and Maryland reported response rates of only 0.7 percent and 1.2 percent, respectively, whereas Connecticut and South Carolina reported receiving more than 70 percent of confirmation notices back from registrants (see NVRA Table 4a).

Figure 7. Status of Confirmation Notices Sent


More than 3 million confirmation notices were either returned as undeliverable or the response to the confirmation notice was deemed invalid by election officials. However, most confirmation notices were categorized as "status unknown" ( 47 percent, indicating that notices were neither returned as undeliverable nor received back from the registrant [Figure 7]). Some states like Arizona ( 48.2 percent) and South Dakota ( 57.1 percent) reported having more confirmation notices returned back as undeliverable than they did in the status unknown category. A total of 18 states and territories did not report the status of confirmation notices. ${ }^{14}$

## Removal from Voter Rolls

With the implementation of the NVRA in 1994, states are required to have evidence that a citizen is no longer living in the jurisdiction where they were registered before removing him or her from the registration rolls. From 2014 to 2016, 16,696,470 citizens ( 8.8 percent of all registrants) were removed from state voter registration rolls (NVRA Table 4b). The number of registrants removed from rolls between 2014 and 2016 was 1.9 million greater than in the same period leading to the 2014 Federal election (i.e., 2012-2014), a 12.8-percent increase. ${ }^{15}$ Most states and territories that provided information about the number of citizens removed from registration rolls reported removing between 5 and 10 percent of their registered voters. At one end of the spectrum was Indiana, which removed 22.4 percent of its registered voters, and at the other extreme was New Mexico, which reported removing only 0.2 percent of its registered voters.

Figure 8. Percentage of Voters Removed from Registration Rolls


The most common reason for a registrant's removal from the rolls was cross-jurisdiction change of address ( 31.1 percent), followed by the NVRA process of failing to respond to a confirmation notice and not voting in the following two Federal elections (26.1 percent). These two reasons accounted for $9,546,871$ registrant removals. Although the total number of registrants removed from the rolls increased, the reasons for removing voters were similar in 2016 to what was reported in the 2012 Presidential election. Overall, 4,110,047 registrants (24.6 percent) were removed due to death. Felony conviction-a disqualifier in most states and territories - was the reason that 334,253 registrants were removed from the rolls during the past election cycle, representing only 2 percent of removals. At the state level, however, we find cases like that of New Mexico, which reported that the main reason for removing voters from rolls was felony, accounting for 48.5 percent of the 2,993 removals in that state. Other reasons for removing voters from the rolls included requests by voters and mental incompetence, which accounted for a combined 1.9 percent for the removals at the national level.

Delaware removed registrants from its registration rolls at a rate similar to the national average. It reported that the main reason for removal was cross-jurisdiction change of address ( 38.8 percent) followed by failure to vote and return a certification notice ( 30.1 percent) and death of the registrant ( 27 percent). In general, felony and mental incompetency represented a small portion of the reason for voter removal in this state (3.7 percent) and at the national level (2.1 percent).

Figure 9. Reason for Removal from Registration Rolls


## State Registration Policies

## Same Day Registration (SDR)

EAC asked states and territories to provide information on voters who register to vote and cast their ballots on the same day. Same Day Registration (SDR) depends on local laws and, thus, is only allowed in some states and territories. Moreover, those states and territories that allow SDR vary widely in the application of this measure. For example, states like Idaho, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming allow SDR for all citizens of age meeting the requirements to register. On the other hand, some states allow SDR only for particular elections (e.g., Rhode Island only allows SDR for President and Vice President), or particular subsets of the population (e.g., UOCAVA voters, recently discharged from the military). Table 5 in the Appendix shows the distribution of SDR categories across U.S. states and territories for the 2016 Presidential election.

It is also important to note that SDR is defined here as the ability to register to vote on a day when it is also possible to cast a ballot. In most cases, Election Day is not the only day that citizens are allowed to vote. Many states (e.g., Illinois and lowa) have an overlap between the date when registration closes and the date when early voting starts, so that there are days when citizens can both register and cast a ballot.

For the 2016 Presidential election, a total of $1,289,578$ voters registered to vote on a day when casting a ballot was allowed (1.7 percent of the total registrations were SDR). Twenty-two states and territories reported having such voters; however, the number of registrations using this method varied widely across states. For example, Idaho reported registering 131,455 citizens on a voting day ( 14 percent of the state's total registrations). Nebraska, which allows citizens to register to vote and vote early on the same day during the period between the opening of early voting and the close of in-person voter registration, had only 1,237 voters use

SDR ( 0.1 percent of the state's total). Among those states that allowed SDR to all citizens, those that do not follow the NVRA and have maintained this registration option for decades (Idaho, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) were among the states that reported the highest rates of SDR (Figure 10.)

Figure 10. Percentage of Same Day Registrations (SDR) in non-NVRA States


## Internet Registration

As of January 27, 2017, 35 states offered online registration; four other states had enacted legislation to create online voter registration systems, but had not yet implemented them. Online voter registration systems are intended to supplement the traditional paper-based process. In general, instead of filling out a paper application, the voter uses a website or phone app to complete a form that is then submitted electronically to election officials.

The review process for those applications completed online follows a series of steps. First, the application is reviewed electronically and, if it is valid, the person is added to the state's voter registration list. Typically, the validation process compares the data from the online registration form with driver's license records (or state-issued identification card records). The driver's license signature becomes the signature on record for voting. If the information does not match, the application is reviewed for further action. ${ }^{16}$

There was a notable increase in the number of online registrations received in the 2016 election cycle. A total of $13,485,127$ registrations was received electronically ( 17.4 percent of the total registrations), a marked growth over the rate in 2012 ( 5.3 percent). Online applications were also rejected at a lower rate, as online applications only accounted for 8.3 percent of the total registrations deemed invalid.

When looking at the total results for internet registrations received for the 2016 Presidential election, Arizona is one of the states where internet registrations account for a large portion of the total registrations processed. Arizona reported that 40.5 percent of the registration applications they received were from the internet. This report is not surprising considering that Arizona was the first state to implement internet registration in 2002.

## Automatic Registration

On January 1, 2016, Oregon became the first state to implement a program of automatic registration. The main difference of this program compared to those in place in the rest of states and territories is that Oregon's registration program now uses an opt-out instead of opt-in method. This opt-out rule means that when Oregonians who meet eligibility criteria for registering to vote use the services of designated state offices (e.g., motor vehicle department),s they are automatically registered to vote without the need to complete an application. Once the automatic registration occurs, the Oregon Election Division sends a letter to the citizen offering three options:

1. do nothing and remain registered as a non-affiliated voter;
2. choose a political party by filling and returning an enclosed postcard; or
3. choose to opt out and decline to register to vote by returning an enclosed postcard.

If the voter does not return the enclosed post card to opt out within 21 days, he or she is considered as registered to vote. But, if an individual is already registered to vote, no action is taken.

Since Oregon's DMV requires proof of legal status in order to issue a driver's license or ID card, the DMV can distinguish between those persons who are U.S. citizens and those who provide the information to the Elections Division to add them to the system and send them a voter registration mailing.

During the two years leading to the 2016 Presidential election, Oregon has seen a 14-percent increase in the number of citizens registered to vote compared to the past two Federal elections. The number of citizens registered in the 2012 and 2014 Federal elections was about 2.2 million, and it increased to more than 2.5 million for the 2016 Presidential election.

## Data Sharing

The Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) is a non-profit corporation governed by a board of directors drawn from its 21 member states (including the District of Columbia). The goal of ERIC is to assist states in identifying inaccurate or out-of-date voter registration records, as well as reach out to eligible but unregistered residents. Members of ERIC submit their voter registration and motor vehicle license data, which include names, addresses, date of birth, and the last four digits of their social security number. Before personally identifiable
information (PII) are transmitted to ERIC, these data are anonymized by states in a way in which privacy is maintained but which can still be used in the ERIC data-matching process.

At the end of this matching process, states are provided several reports, including (1) of voters who have potentially moved, (2) of voters who have potentially died, and (3) of voters who are potentially eligible to vote but are unregistered. States can then begin the process of updating problematic voter registrations or encouraging eligible individuals to register to vote. A number of states also participate in the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck, which is used to identify possible double registrations and double votes.

## Endnotes

152 U.S.C. §20501
${ }^{2}$ Jurisdictions in some states (e.g., Wyoming) do not include inactive voters as "those people registered and eligible to vote."
${ }^{3}$ The states and territories that did not provide information are North Dakota (does not require voters to register) and American Samoa (did not complete the EAVS).
${ }^{4}$ Not all jurisdictions reported the number of active and inactive voters. Thus, the total number of active and inactive voters does not add up to the total registered voters.
${ }^{5}$ The sum of active (item A3a) and inactive (item a3b) voters did not equal the total registrants (item A1a) reported by AL, LA, and TX. Also, SC reported a number of inactive voters $(275,292)$ even though the state does not consider inactive voters as registered and report the same number for active and registered voters $(3,157,027)$.
${ }^{6}$ This number includes both valid and invalid registration applications.
${ }^{7}$ Only those registrations in the categories "new valid registration," "change of address" (within jurisdiction and cross jurisdiction), and "pre-registrations" are included as valid in this case, as the category "other" contains cases of both valid and invalid registrations.

8 Some jurisdictions did not report if the registration applications they received were valid or not. Thus, the sum of valid and not valid applications does not add up the total number of registrations received (about 6 percent of registrations were not categorized.)
${ }^{9}$ The survey did not ask states and territories to provide the reasons for these rejections.
${ }^{10}$ The states of KS, NH, and OR did not report the source of invalid registrations, whereas GU, MS, UT, WI, and WV did not report the source of duplicate registrations, and CT, ID, PR, RI, SC, VI, and WY did not report the source of either duplicated or invalid registrations (ND does not use voter registration).
${ }^{11} 52$ U.S.C. §20501
1252 U.S.C. §20507
${ }^{13}$ There was no information about confirmation notice's use from AS, DC, IN, KY, PR, RI, WI or ND (does not have voter registration).
${ }^{14}$ DC, IA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MN, MS, NC, NJ, OR, PR, RI, VT, WI, and WY did not provide the status of the confirmation notices sent. ND does not use confirmation notices as they do not require a voter's registration.
${ }^{15}$ Fifty states provided data about voters' removal from rolls in the 2014-2016 period compared to the 48 states that provided the data for the 2012-2014 stretch, thus, accounting for some of the increase in this topic. However, the increase was much larger than what could be expected for the addition of the data for two states.
${ }^{16}$ Information retrieved from the National Council of State Legislatures (NCSL), http://www.ncsl.org/ research/elections-and-campaigns/electronic-or-online-voter-registration.aspx

## NVRA Appendix A: NVRA Tables

| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
| Alabama | 2016 | 3,620,994 | 3,333,946 | 92.07 | 27 | 3,189,293 | 3,049,655 | 91.47 | 139,638 | 4.19 |
|  | 2014 | 3,600,135 | 2,986,782 | 82.96 | 37 | 2,986,782 | 2,873,356 | 96.2 | 113,426 | 3.8 |
|  | 2012 | 3,544,659 | 3,162,135 | 89.21 | 25 | 3,162,135 | 2,833,938 | 89.62 | 328,197 | 10.38 |
|  | 2010 | 3,481,374 | 2,964,070 | 85.14 | 38 | 2,964,070 | 2,586,282 | 87.25 | 377,788 | 12.75 |
|  | 2008 | 3,437,238 | 2,978,339 | 86.65 | 34 | 2,978,339 | 2,806,671 | 94.24 | 171,668 | 5.76 |
| Alaska | 2016 | 523,747 | 587,303 | 112.13 | 2 | 587,303 | 528,671 | 90.02 | 58,632 | 9.98 |
|  | 2014 | 519,016 | 574,441 | 110.68 | 1 | 574,441 | 509,011 | 88.61 | 65,430 | 11.39 |
|  | 2012 | 503,361 | 579,304 | 115.09 | 2 | 579,304 | 506,432 | 87.42 | 72,872 | 12.58 |
|  | 2010 | 483,060 | 560,146 | 115.96 | 2 | 560,146 | 494,876 | 88.35 | 65,270 | 11.65 |
|  | 2008 | 483,534 | 495,731 | 102.52 | 2 | 570,666 | 495,731 | 100 | 74,935 | 15.12 |
| American Samoa | 2016 | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
|  | 2014 | . | 16,776 | . | . | 16,776 | 16,776 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | . | 17,764 | . | . | 17,764 | 17,764 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | . | 16,124 | . | . | 16,124 | 16,124 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | . | 16,780 | . | . | 16,780 | 16,780 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Arizona | 2016 | 4,526,594 | 4,080,680 | 90.15 | 31 | 4,080,680 | 3,589,084 | 87.95 | 491,596 | 12.05 |
|  | 2014 | 4,444,236 | 3,802,786 | 85.57 | 30 | 3,802,786 | 3,235,901 | 85.09 | 566,885 | 14.91 |
|  | 2012 | 4,285,736 | 3,725,362 | 86.92 | 34 | 3,725,362 | 3,124,712 | 83.88 | 600,650 | 16.12 |
|  | 2010 | 4,110,889 | 3,502,743 | 85.21 | 37 | 3,502,743 | 3,146,418 | 89.83 | 356,325 | 10.17 |
|  | 2008 | 4,182,834 | 2,987,451 | 71.42 | 46 | 3,441,141 | 2,987,451 | 100 | 453,690 | 15.19 |
| Arkansas | 2016 | 2,164,083 | 1,765,513 | 81.58 | 47 | 1,765,513 | 1,422,393 | 80.57 | 343,120 | 19.43 |
|  | 2014 | 2,152,344 | 1,695,208 | 78.76 | 43 | 1,695,208 | 1,453,485 | 85.74 | 241,723 | 14.26 |
|  | 2012 | 2,126,799 | 1,610,364 | 75.72 | 46 | 1,610,364 | 1,282,491 | 79.64 | 327,873 | 20.36 |
|  | 2010 | 2,090,151 | 1,638,135 | 78.37 | 45 | 1,638,135 | 1,326,681 | 80.99 | 311,454 | 19.01 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2008 | 2,074,761 | 1,684,240 | 81.18 | 40 | 1,684,240 | 1,364,741 | 81.03 | 319,499 | 18.97 |
| California | 2016 | 24,280,349 | 24,486,638 | 100.85 | 7 | 24,501,602 | 19,435,856 | 79.37 | 5,065,746 | 20.69 |
|  | 2014 | 23,881,288 | 18,139,232 | 75.96 | 45 | 23,110,142 | 17,785,312 | 98.05 | 5,324,830 | 29.36 |
|  | 2012 | 23,072,672 | 18,996,338 | 82.33 | 43 | 25,599,182 | 18,255,385 | 96.1 | 7,343,797 | 38.66 |
|  | 2010 | 22,329,319 | 17,299,348 | 77.47 | 46 | 23,666,464 | 17,299,348 | 100 | 6,367,117 | 36.81 |
|  | 2008 | 22,944,128 | 17,394,200 | 75.81 | 44 | 23,424,160 | 17,394,226 | 100 | 6,029,935 | 34.67 |
| Colorado | 2016 | 3,750,953 | 3,840,303 | 102.38 | 3 | 3,840,303 | 3,336,663 | 86.89 | 503,640 | 13.11 |
|  | 2014 | 3,679,122 | 3,649,105 | 99.18 | 3 | 3,649,105 | 2,889,034 | 79.17 | 760,071 | 20.83 |
|  | 2012 | 3,541,578 | 3,651,091 | 103.09 | 3 | 3,651,091 | 2,612,360 | 71.55 | 1038731 | 28.45 |
|  | 2010 | 3,403,804 | 3,293,942 | 96.77 | 9 | 3,293,942 | 2,477,202 | 75.2 | 816,740 | 24.8 |
|  | 2008 | 3,395,483 | 3,214,382 | 94.67 | 14 | 3,214,382 | 2,645,793 | 82.31 | 568,589 | 17.69 |
| Connecticut | 2016 | 2,574,178 | 2,331,684 | 90.58 | 29 | 2,331,684 | 2,162,797 | 92.76 | 168,887 | 7.24 |
|  | 2014 | 2,564,233 | 2,160,979 | 84.27 | 33 | 2,160,979 | 1,968,094 | 91.07 | 192,885 | 8.93 |
|  | 2012 | 2,529,371 | 2,202,278 | 87.07 | 33 | 2,202,278 | 2,081,650 | 94.52 | 120,628 | 5.48 |
|  | 2010 | 2,493,096 | 2,150,633 | 86.26 | 35 | 2,150,633 | 2,026,874 | 94.25 | 123,759 | 5.75 |
|  | 2008 | 2,492,127 | 2,090,788 | 83.9 | 37 | 2,144,301 | 2,090,788 | 100 | 53,513 | 2.56 |
| Delaware | 2016 | 681,606 | 675,663 | 99.13 | 10 | 675,663 | 642,334 | 95.07 | 33,329 | 4.93 |
|  | 2014 | 674,336 | 642,022 | 95.21 | 9 | 642,022 | 596,284 | 92.88 | 45,738 | 7.12 |
|  | 2012 | 655,782 | 632,805 | 96.5 | 9 | 632,805 | 594,200 | 93.9 | 38,605 | 6.1 |
|  | 2010 | 638,160 | 623,425 | 97.69 | 7 | 623,425 | 603,456 | 96.8 | 19,969 | 3.2 |
|  | 2008 | 626,923 | 602,726 | 96.14 | 10 | 602,726 | 560,705 | 93.03 | 42,021 | 6.97 |
| District of Columbia | 2016 | 485,116 | 493,287 | 101.68 | 5 | 493,287 | 493,287 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 475,399 | 456,633 | 96.05 | 7 | 456,633 | 456,633 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 454,205 | 557,774 | 122.8 | 1 | 557,774 | 483,600 | 86.7 | 74,174 | 13.3 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2010 | 435,873 | 512,897 | 117.67 | 1 | 512,897 | 454,695 | 88.65 | 58,202 | 11.35 |
|  | 2008 | 436,062 | 426,671 | 97.85 | 5 | 561,671 | 426,671 | 100 | 135,000 | 31.64 |
| Florida | 2016 | 13,933,052 | 13,505,571 | 96.93 | 16 | 13,505,571 | 12,853,866 | 95.17 | 651,705 | 4.83 |
|  | 2014 | 13,673,536 | 12,689,081 | 92.80 | 13 | 12,689,081 | 11,869,224 | 93.54 | 819,857 | 6.46 |
|  | 2012 | 13,207,184 | 11,934,446 | 90.36 | 22 | 11,934,446 | 11,934,446 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 12,812,527 | 12,551,969 | 97.97 | 6 | 12,551,969 | 11,228,681 | 89.46 | 1,323,288 | 10.54 |
|  | 2008 | 12,732,631 | 12,562,978 | 98.67 | 4 | 12,562,978 | 11,251,114 | 89.56 | 1,311,864 | 10.44 |
| Georgia | 2016 | 6,978,660 | 6,657,621 | 95.4 | 20 | 6,657,621 | 5,463,014 | 82.06 | 1,194,607 | 17.94 |
|  | 2014 | 6,882,879 | 6,029,703 | 87.6 | 25 | 6,029,703 | 5,158,372 | 85.55 | 871,331 | 14.45 |
|  | 2012 | 6,693,989 | 6,050,050 | 90.38 | 21 | 6,036,864 | 5,389,596 | 89.08 | 647,268 | 10.7 |
|  | 2010 | 6,476,089 | 5,748,459 | 88.76 | 26 | 5,748,459 | 5,027,430 | 87.46 | 721,029 | 12.54 |
|  | 2008 | 6,576,814 | 5,755,750 | 87.52 | 32 | 5,755,750 | 5,184,912 | 90.08 | 570,838 | 9.92 |
| Guam | 2016 | . | 51,720 | . | . | 51,720 | 51,720 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | . | 51,975 | . | . | 51,975 | 51,975 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | . | 50,701 | . | . | 50,701 | 50,701 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | . | 52,821 | . | . | 52,821 | 52,821 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | . | 50,806 | . | . | 50,806 | 50,806 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 2016 | 1,001,729 | 751,483 | 75.02 | 49 | 751,483 | 666,573 | 88.7 | 84,910 | 11.3 |
|  | 2014 | 989,250 | 708,721 | 71.64 | 47 | 708,721 | 630,640 | 88.98 | 78,081 | 11.02 |
|  | 2012 | 962,794 | 705,668 | 73.29 | 47 | 705,668 | 638,883 | 90.54 | 66,785 | 9.46 |
|  | 2010 | 941,595 | 692,745 | 73.57 | 49 | 690,745 | 605,532 | 87.41 | 85,213 | 12.3 |
|  | 2008 | 917,666 | 691,356 | 75.34 | 45 | 592,119 | 526,672 | 76.18 | 65,447 | 9.47 |
| Idaho | 2016 | 1,130,550 | 936,529 | 82.84 | 46 | 936,529 | 936,529 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 1,116,710 | 793,709 | 71.08 | 48 | 793,709 | 793,709 | 100 | 0 | 0 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration $\%$ of CVAP | Ranking of $\%$ of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2012 | 1,087,265 | 895,834 | 82.39 | 42 | 895,834 | 895,834 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 1,056,003 | 790,531 | 74.86 | 48 | 790,531 | 790,531 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 1,043,915 | 861,869 | 82.56 | 39 | 861,869 | 861,869 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois | 2016 | 8,979,999 | 8,843,038 | 98.47 | 12 | 8,843,038 | 8,055,096 | 91.09 | 787,942 | 8.91 |
|  | 2014 | 8,939,894 | 8,336,548 | 93.25 | 12 | 8,253,161 | 7,333,048 | 87.96 | 920,113 | 11.04 |
|  | 2012 | 8,826,635 | 8,116,660 | 91.96 | 18 | 8,551,866 | 7,505,775 | 92.47 | 1046091 | 12.89 |
|  | 2010 | 8,717,363 | 8,542,380 | 97.99 | 5 | 8,542,380 | 7,455,059 | 87.27 | 1,087,321 | 12.73 |
|  | 2008 | 8,908,592 | 0 | 0 | . | 8,895,584 | 7,600,829 |  | 1,294,755 |  |
| Indiana | 2016 | 4,801,113 | 4,839,038 | 100.79 | 8 | 4,839,038 | 4,149,560 | 85.75 | 689,478 | 14.25 |
|  | 2014 | 4,773,227 | 4,587,021 | 96.1 | 6 | 4,587,021 | 3,855,819 | 84.06 | 731,202 | 15.94 |
|  | 2012 | 4,712,808 | 4,562,268 | 96.81 | 8 | 4,562,268 | 4,407,876 | 96.62 | 154,392 | 3.38 |
|  | 2010 | 4,649,341 | 4,329,977 | 93.13 | 15 | 4,329,977 | 4,196,884 | 96.93 | 133,093 | 3.07 |
|  | 2008 | 4,631,777 | 4,515,057 | 97.48 | 6 | 4,515,057 | 4,137,606 | 91.64 | 377,451 | 8.36 |
| Iowa | 2016 | 2,285,126 | 2,222,380 | 97.25 | 14 | 2,222,380 | 2,047,368 | 92.13 | 175,012 | 7.87 |
|  | 2014 | 2,273,765 | 2,142,572 | 94.23 | 11 | 2,142,572 | 1,937,709 | 90.44 | 204,863 | 9.56 |
|  | 2012 | 2,249,702 | 2,236,068 | 99.39 | 5 | 2,169,779 | 1,960,086 | 87.66 | 209,693 | 9.38 |
|  | 2010 | 2,222,850 | 2,116,170 | 95.2 | 11 | 2,116,170 | 1,984,995 | 93.8 | 131,175 | 6.2 |
|  | 2008 | 2,217,983 | 2,143,665 | 96.65 | 8 | 2,143,665 | 2,003,901 | 93.48 | 139,764 | 6.52 |
| Kansas | 2016 | 2,053,919 | 1,785,834 | 86.95 | 41 | 1,785,834 | 1,601,818 | 89.7 | 184,016 | 10.3 |
|  | 2014 | 2,043,785 | 1,747,792 | 85.52 | 31 | 1,710,125 | 1,560,327 | 89.27 | 149,798 | 8.57 |
|  | 2012 | 2,019,955 | 1,771,252 | 87.69 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 1,989,383 | 1,725,012 | 86.71 | 34 | 1,725,012 | 1,580,688 | 91.63 | 144,324 | 8.37 |
|  | 2008 | 1,998,454 | 1,749,756 | 87.56 | 31 | 1,749,756 | 1,579,928 | 90.29 | 169,828 | 9.71 |
| Kentucky | 2016 | 3,297,108 | 3,306,120 | 100.27 | 9 | 3,306,120 | 3,306,120 | 100 | 0 | 0 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2014 | 3,281,582 | 3,147,100 | 95.9 | 8 | 3,227,461 | 3,147,100 | 100 | 80,361 | 2.55 |
|  | 2012 | 3,238,364 | 3,037,153 | 93.79 | 15 | 3,128,264 | 3,037,153 | 100 | 91,111 | 3 |
|  | 2010 | 3,189,843 | 2,885,775 | 90.47 | 21 | 3,024,241 | 2,880,155 | 99.81 | 144,086 | 4.99 |
|  | 2008 | 3,174,252 | 2,906,809 | 91.57 | 20 | 3,045,858 | 2,906,809 | 100 | 139,049 | 4.78 |
| Louisiana | 2016 | 3,410,634 | 3,058,741 | 89.68 | 34 | 3,023,241 | 2,891,902 | 94.55 | 131,339 | 4.29 |
|  | 2014 | 3,385,548 | 2,935,692 | 86.71 | 28 | 2,935,692 | 2,772,069 | 94.43 | 163,623 | 5.57 |
|  | 2012 | 3,323,626 | 2,965,751 | 89.23 | 24 | 2,965,751 | 2,786,355 | 93.95 | 179,396 | 6.05 |
|  | 2010 | 3,241,183 | 2,935,062 | 90.56 | 20 | 2,935,062 | 2,711,974 | 92.4 | 223,088 | 7.6 |
|  | 2008 | 3,174,725 | 2,942,160 | 92.67 | 17 | 2,942,160 | 2,714,586 | 92.27 | 227,574 | 7.73 |
| Maine | 2016 | 1,048,274 | 1,065,100 | 101.61 | 6 | 1,065,100 | 1,059,270 | 99.45 | 5,830 | 0.55 |
|  | 2014 | 1,044,335 | 1,014,674 | 97.16 | 5 | 1,014,674 | 989,331 | 97.5 | 25,343 | 2.5 |
|  | 2012 | 1,038,188 | 1,026,086 | 98.83 | 6 | 1,026,086 | 984,750 | 95.97 | 41,336 | 4.03 |
|  | 2010 | 1,029,240 | 1,028,501 | 99.93 | 4 | 1,028,501 | 984,455 | 95.72 | 44,046 | 4.28 |
|  | 2008 | 1,018,687 | 1,065,064 | 104.55 | 1 | 1,065,064 | 987,431 | 92.71 | 77,633 | 7.29 |
| Maryland | 2016 | 4,182,241 | 3,900,090 | 93.25 | 25 | 3,900,090 | 3,900,090 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 4,142,452 | 3,701,666 | 89.36 | 20 | 3,701,665 | 3,701,665 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 4,045,434 | 3,694,658 | 91.33 | 20 | 3,694,658 | 3,694,658 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 3,964,251 | 3,468,287 | 87.49 | 31 | 3,468,287 | 3,468,287 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 3,971,433 | 3,432,645 | 86.43 | 35 | 3,641,728 | 3,432,645 | 100 | 209,083 | 6.09 |
| Massachusetts | 2016 | 4,850,598 | 4,534,974 | 93.49 | 24 | 4,534,974 | 3,994,635 | 88.09 | 540,339 | 11.91 |
|  | 2014 | 4,799,876 | 4,301,118 | 89.61 | 19 | 4,301,118 | 3,769,892 | 87.65 | 531,226 | 12.35 |
|  | 2012 | 4,698,978 | 4,340,000 | 92.36 | 17 | 4,340,000 | 3,670,305 | 84.57 | 669,695 | 15.43 |
|  | 2010 | 4,602,185 | 4,121,180 | 89.55 | 23 | 4,121,180 | 3,684,321 | 89.4 | 436,859 | 10.6 |
|  | 2008 | 4,667,918 | 4,220,488 | 90.41 | 26 | 4,220,488 | 3,883,031 | 92 | 337,457 | 8 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration $\%$ of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
| Michigan | 2016 | 7,380,136 | 7,514,055 | 101.81 | 4 | 7,514,055 | 6,748,385 | 89.81 | 765,670 | 10.19 |
|  | 2014 | 7,347,661 | 7,446,280 | 101.34 | 2 | 7,446,280 | 6,578,733 | 88.35 | 867,547 | 11.65 |
|  | 2012 | 7,293,126 | 7,454,553 | 102.21 | 4 | 7,454,553 | 6,537,332 | 87.7 | 917,221 | 12.3 |
|  | 2010 | 7,266,065 | 7,276,237 | 100.14 | 3 | 7,276,237 | 7,276,237 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 7,379,745 | 7,470,764 | 101.23 | 3 | 7,470,764 | 7,470,764 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 2016 | 3,950,807 | 3,473,972 | 87.93 | 39 | 3,473,972 | 3,473,972 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 3,920,514 | 3,197,751 | 81.56 | 39 | 3,197,751 | 3,197,751 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 3,850,635 | 3,387,783 | 87.98 | 29 | 3,387,783 | 3,387,783 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 3,783,732 | 3,220,844 | 85.12 | 39 | 3,220,844 | 3,220,844 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 3,781,858 | 3,472,312 | 91.81 | 18 | 3,472,312 | 3,472,312 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 2016 | 2,210,424 | 2,072,395 | 93.76 | 23 | 2,072,395 | 1,888,433 | 91.12 | 183,962 | 8.88 |
|  | 2014 | 2,201,531 | 1,484,859 | 67.45 | 49 | 1,528,686 | 1,423,206 | 95.85 | 105,480 | 7.1 |
|  | 2012 | 2,174,109 | 1,399,209 | 64.36 | 49 | 1,398,591 | 1,328,196 | 94.92 | 70,395 | 5.03 |
|  | 2010 | 2,146,421 | 1,978,463 | 92.17 | 17 | 1,729,159 | 1,624,981 | 82.13 | 104,178 | 5.27 |
|  | 2008 | 2,127,914 | 1,068,776 | 50.23 | 49 | 1,103,088 | 1,033,228 | 96.67 | 69,860 | 6.54 |
| Missouri | 2016 | 4,525,035 | 4,215,860 | 93.17 | 26 | 4,215,860 | 3,812,576 | 90.43 | 403,284 | 9.57 |
|  | 2014 | 4,502,998 | 4,090,939 | 90.85 | 16 | 4,090,939 | 3,627,153 | 88.66 | 463,786 | 11.34 |
|  | 2012 | 4,445,706 | 4,191,778 | 94.29 | 14 | 4,191,778 | 3,738,791 | 89.19 | 452,987 | 10.81 |
|  | 2010 | 4,384,196 | 4,137,495 | 94.37 | 12 | 4,137,495 | 3,674,460 | 88.81 | 463,035 | 11.19 |
|  | 2008 | 4,367,368 | 4,154,113 | 95.12 | 12 | 4,154,113 | 3,770,193 | 90.76 | 383,920 | 9.24 |
| Montana | 2016 | 781,250 | 694,370 | 88.88 | 36 | 694,370 | 574,334 | 82.71 | 120,036 | 17.29 |
|  | 2014 | 774,019 | 674,264 | 87.11 | 27 | 674,264 | 555,005 | 82.31 | 119,259 | 17.69 |
|  | 2012 | 759,474 | 681,608 | 89.75 | 23 | 681,608 | 553,048 | 81.14 | 128,560 | 18.86 |
|  | 2010 | 742,844 | 651,335 | 87.68 | 30 | 651,335 | 549,683 | 84.39 | 101,652 | 15.61 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2008 | 729,754 | 668,085 | 91.55 | 21 | 668,085 | 562,141 | 84.14 | 105,944 | 15.86 |
| Nebraska | 2016 | 1,333,860 | 1,211,101 | 90.8 | 28 | 1,211,101 | 1,091,951 | 90.16 | 119,150 | 9.84 |
|  | 2014 | 1,324,464 | 1,160,169 | 87.6 | 26 | 1,160,167 | 1,017,575 | 87.71 | 142,592 | 12.29 |
|  | 2012 | 1,305,336 | 1,163,871 | 89.16 | 26 | 1,163,871 | 1,035,285 | 88.95 | 128,586 | 11.05 |
|  | 2010 | 1,284,814 | 1,142,247 | 88.9 | 25 | 1,142,247 | 1,020,637 | 89.35 | 121,610 | 10.65 |
|  | 2008 | 1,277,174 | 1,157,034 | 90.59 | 24 | 1,157,034 | 1,157,034 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Nevada | 2016 | 1,863,799 | 1,678,883 | 90.08 | 32 | 1,678,883 | 1,468,559 | 87.47 | 210,324 | 12.53 |
|  | 2014 | 1,830,238 | 1,476,337 | 80.66 | 41 | 1,476,337 | 1,212,051 | 82.1 | 264,286 | 17.9 |
|  | 2012 | 1,764,037 | 1,258,409 | 71.34 | 48 | 1,497,822 | 1,258,409 | 100 | 239,413 | 19.03 |
|  | 2010 | 1,701,526 | 1,375,848 | 80.86 | 42 | 1,371,346 | 1,114,395 | 81 | 256,951 | 18.68 |
|  | 2008 | 1,667,936 | 1,446,538 | 86.73 | 33 | 1,447,046 | 1,208,382 | 83.54 | 238,664 | 16.5 |
| New Hampshire | 2016 | 1,020,130 | 988,398 | 96.89 | 17 | 988,398 | 988,398 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 1,013,648 | 877,514 | 86.57 | 29 | 877,514 | 877,514 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 1,001,684 | 878,136 | 87.67 | 31 | 878,135 | 878,135 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 987,480 | 945,341 | 95.73 | 10 | 945,341 | 945,341 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 989,070 | 958,528 | 96.91 | 7 | 958,528 | 958,528 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 2016 | 6,053,893 | 5,751,090 | 95 | 21 | 5,751,090 | 5,321,542 | 92.53 | 429,548 | 7.47 |
|  | 2014 | 6,002,841 | 5,552,481 | 92.5 | 14 | 5,552,481 | 4,943,194 | 89.03 | 609,287 | 10.97 |
|  | 2012 | 5,918,655 | 5,415,639 | 91.5 | 19 | 5,415,639 | 5,016,550 | 92.63 | 399,089 | 7.37 |
|  | 2010 | 5,838,036 | 5,135,830 | 87.97 | 29 | 5,135,830 | 4,719,468 | 91.89 | 416,362 | 8.11 |
|  | 2008 | 5,948,987 | 5,386,427 | 90.54 | 25 | 5,386,415 | 4,917,772 | 91.3 | 468,643 | 8.7 |
| New Mexico | 2016 | 1,457,632 | 1,289,420 | 88.46 | 38 | 1,288,336 | 1,136,059 | 88.11 | 152,277 | 11.81 |
|  | 2014 | 1,448,022 | 1,287,325 | 88.9 | 23 | 1,279,323 | 1,002,610 | 77.88 | 276,713 | 21.5 |
|  | 2012 | 1,420,961 | 1,252,438 | 88.14 | 28 | 647,100 | 541,077 | 43.2 | 106,023 | 8.47 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2010 | 1,383,780 | 1,147,177 | 82.9 | 41 | 1,147,177 | 1,066,970 | 93.01 | 80,207 | 6.99 |
|  | 2008 | 1,364,409 | 908,052 | 66.55 | 47 | 805,662 | 742,901 | 81.81 | 62,761 | 6.91 |
| New York | 2016 | 13,531,404 | 16,200,892 | 119.73 | 1 | 16,200,892 | 16,200,892 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 13,425,020 | 11,806,742 | 87.95 | 24 | 11,805,572 | 10,827,434 | 91.71 | 978,138 | 8.28 |
|  | 2012 | 13,204,950 | 11,720,541 | 88.76 | 27 | 5,913,605 | 5,403,806 | 46.11 | 509,799 | 4.35 |
|  | 2010 | 13,004,817 | 11,806,744 | 90.79 | 19 | 11,807,027 | 10,680,536 | 90.46 | 1,126,491 | 9.54 |
|  | 2008 | 13,397,989 | 12,031,312 | 89.8 | 27 | 12,031,312 | 10,816,500 | 89.9 | 1,214,812 | 10.1 |
| North Carolina | 2016 | 7,107,998 | 6,924,469 | 97.42 | 13 | 6,924,469 | 5,930,252 | 85.64 | 994,217 | 14.36 |
|  | 2014 | 7,015,219 | 6,628,521 | 94.49 | 10 | 6,628,521 | 5,873,618 | 88.61 | 754,903 | 11.39 |
|  | 2012 | 6,826,612 | 6,655,291 | 97.49 | 7 | 6,655,291 | 5,986,515 | 89.95 | 668,776 | 10.05 |
|  | 2010 | 6,607,031 | 6,207,093 | 93.95 | 14 | 6,207,093 | 5,756,403 | 92.74 | 450,690 | 7.26 |
|  | 2008 | 6,501,803 | 6,226,204 | 95.76 | 11 | 6,264,733 | 5,847,456 | 93.92 | 417,277 | 6.7 |
| North Dakota | 2016 | 546,486 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2014 | 535,556 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2012 | 517,098 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2010 | 503,755 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2008 | 489,562 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 2016 | 8,709,050 | 7,861,025 | 90.26 | 30 | 7,861,025 | 7,861,025 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 8,678,486 | 7,748,201 | 89.28 | 21 | 7,748,201 | 6,374,206 | 82.27 | 1,373,995 | 17.73 |
|  | 2012 | 8,613,174 | 7,987,697 | 92.74 | 16 | 7,987,697 | 6,621,906 | 82.9 | 1,365,791 | 17.1 |
|  | 2010 | 8,547,606 | 8,044,315 | 94.11 | 13 | 8,048,315 | 8,048,315 | 100.05 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 8,567,464 | 8,113,307 | 94.7 | 13 | 6,909,368 | 5,521,203 | 68.05 | 1,388,165 | 17.11 |
| Oklahoma | 2016 | 2,768,561 | 2,157,450 | 77.93 | 48 | 2,157,450 | 1,817,461 | 84.24 | 339,989 | 15.76 |
|  | 2014 | 2,749,197 | 2,022,456 | 73.57 | 46 | 2,022,456 | 1,632,500 | 80.72 | 389,956 | 19.28 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2012 | 2,699,981 | 2,114,489 | 78.31 | 45 | 2,114,489 | 1,811,650 | 85.68 | 302,839 | 14.32 |
|  | 2010 | 2,647,106 | 2,082,428 | 78.67 | 44 | 2,082,428 | 1,773,975 | 85.19 | 308,453 | 14.81 |
|  | 2008 | 2,613,005 | 2,184,086 | 83.59 | 38 | 2,184,086 | 1,879,809 | 86.07 | 304,277 | 13.93 |
| Oregon | 2016 | 2,867,670 | 2,553,810 | 89.06 | 35 | 2,553,810 | 2,553,810 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 2,830,526 | 2,174,763 | 76.83 | 44 | 2,174,763 | 2,174,763 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 2,763,608 | 2,199,360 | 79.58 | 44 | 2,199,360 | 2,199,360 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 2,692,193 | 2,068,798 | 76.84 | 47 | 2,068,798 | 2,068,798 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 2,687,996 | 2,153,914 | 80.13 | 41 | 2,628,479 | 2,153,914 | 100 | 474,565 | 22.03 |
| Pennsylvania | 2016 | 9,710,416 | 8,722,975 | 89.83 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 9,676,902 | 8,072,589 | 83.42 | 34 | 8,072,589 | 7,322,470 | 90.71 | 750,119 | 9.29 |
|  | 2012 | 9,590,431 | 8,352,342 | 87.09 | 32 | 8,352,342 | 7,771,517 | 93.05 | 580,825 | 6.95 |
|  | 2010 | 9,475,231 | 8,220,759 | 86.76 | 33 | 8,220,756 | 7,499,183 | 91.22 | 721,573 | 8.78 |
|  | 2008 | 9,394,395 | 8,755,588 | 93.2 | 16 | 8,599,364 | 7,858,607 | 89.76 | 740,757 | 8.46 |
| Puerto Rico | 2016 | . | 2,867,558 |  | . | 2,867,558 | 2,867,558 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 2,747,208 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 | . | 2,402,941 |  | . | 2,733,843 | 2,402,941 | 100 | 330,902 | 13.77 |
|  | 2010 | 2,754,346 | . |  | . | . |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | . | 2,458,141 |  | . | 3,762,658 | 2,458,036 | 100 | 1,304,622 | 53.07 |
| Rhode Island | 2016 | 776,565 | 754,065 | 97.1 | 15 | 753,457 | 721,211 | 95.64 | 32,246 | 4.28 |
|  | 2014 | 773,774 | 752,051 | 97.19 | 4 | 752,051 | 691,804 | 91.99 | 60,247 | 8.01 |
|  | 2012 | 766,303 | 725,309 | 94.65 | 11 | 725,309 | 661,028 | 91.14 | 64,281 | 8.86 |
|  | 2010 | 761,674 | 706,161 | 92.71 | 16 | 706,161 | 647,569 | 91.7 | 58,592 | 8.3 |
|  | 2008 | 765,788 | 701,307 | 91.58 | 19 | 701,207 | 653,793 | 93.22 | 47,414 | 6.76 |
| South Carolina | 2016 | 3,566,508 | 3,157,027 | 88.52 | 37 | 3,432,319 | 3,157,027 | 100 | 275,292 | 8.72 |


|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{\text { n }}{\text { N }} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline-\infty \\ \dot{\theta} \end{array}$ | $$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{~}} \\ \dot{H} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\infty}{0} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \infty \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{array}$ | $\underset{\substack{\circ}}{\stackrel{\circ}{0}}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{7}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{H}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \stackrel{0}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \stackrel{L}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ \infty \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}}}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{~}{n}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \text { No } \\ & 0 \\ & \mathscr{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & J \\ & \pm \\ & \infty \\ & N \\ & - \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hat{0} \\ m \\ { }_{j}^{2} \\ \vec{\gamma} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{2}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddagger \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \stackrel{5}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \stackrel{7}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \stackrel{N}{n} \\ & \hat{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{8}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \underset{\sim}{c} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & N \\ & N \\ & N \\ & N \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -7 \\ & - \\ & 0 \\ & 10 \\ & 0 \\ & - \end{aligned}$ |  | $J$ $J$ $\infty$ 0 0 $i$ $i$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | $0$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \mathbf{N} \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{\hat{N}} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{m} \\ & \dot{8} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\infty$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\infty} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{2} \\ \dot{子} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \text { N } \\ \stackrel{1}{2} \\ \dot{\sigma} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\underset{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{N}} \underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}}{ }$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & 0 \\ & \dot{0} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{8}{\mathrm{O}}$ | O |  |  | 8 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & - \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{N}{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{寸} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { M} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\Omega}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & -i \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & j \\ & j \\ & - \\ & j \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & \hat{N} \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\ominus}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ N \\ \tilde{N} \\ \dot{N} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \substack{0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \hline} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 边 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{o} \\ & \underset{N}{2} \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{O}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{1}{2}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & N \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{m} \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{N}{n} \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & 10 \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{j} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & N_{1} \\ & \tilde{j} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\infty$ 0 0 0 $i$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{1}{0}$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | ¢ | ¢ | $\stackrel{m}{7}$ | N | $\stackrel{\otimes}{m}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\mathbb{L}}{\frac{1}{2}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \varrho \\ & \hline \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\infty}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{r} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & - \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{m} \\ & \underset{\sigma}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{F} \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{N} \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ & \underset{\infty}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{N}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{1} \\ & \underset{6}{6} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & - \\ & \infty \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & N \\ & N \\ & N \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \underset{N}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N8 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \text { N} \\ & \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | O <br> $\underset{\sim}{7}$ <br> N <br> N <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { On } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{m} \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sigma}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\infty} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \\ & \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} m \\ \underset{N}{N} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ N \\ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{历} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & - \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | 0 $\underset{N}{1}$ $\underset{y}{n}$ n n | $\begin{gathered} -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ N \\ N \\ N \\ \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { İ } \\ & \text { İ } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline m \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & N \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \gamma^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \mathcal{F} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline- \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & N \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & N \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hat{N} \\ \hat{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \\ & e \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{A}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{\lambda}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{N}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \text { N } \end{gathered}$ | $$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\ \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{O} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{gathered}$ | © | $\stackrel{0}{1}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\lambda}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{-}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \end{gathered}$ | － |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of \% of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
| Utah | 2016 | 1,868,008 | 1,577,069 | 84.43 | 45 | 1,577,069 | 1,414,758 | 89.71 | 162,311 | 10.29 |
|  | 2014 | 1,831,260 | 1,485,705 | 81.13 | 40 | 1,485,705 | 1,246,191 | 83.88 | 239,514 | 16.12 |
|  | 2012 | 1,765,346 | 1,508,372 | 85.44 | 39 | 1,508,372 | 1,325,786 | 87.9 | 182,586 | 12.1 |
|  | 2010 | 1,696,058 | 1,500,305 | 88.46 | 28 | 1,500,305 | 1,338,747 | 89.23 | 161,558 | 10.77 |
|  | 2008 | 1,734,576 | 1,575,310 | 90.82 | 23 | 1,575,310 | 1,342,326 | 85.21 | 232,984 | 14.79 |
| Vermont | 2016 | 493,124 | 472,289 | 95.77 | 19 | 472,289 | 440,347 | 93.24 | 31,942 | 6.76 |
|  | 2014 | 491,548 | 444,199 | 90.37 | 17 | 444,199 | 412,872 | 92.95 | 31,327 | 7.05 |
|  | 2012 | 487,804 | 460,817 | 94.47 | 13 | 431,005 | 394,636 | 85.64 | 36,369 | 7.89 |
|  | 2010 | 481,702 | 439,333 | 91.2 | 18 | 414,889 | 386,501 | 87.97 | 28,388 | 6.46 |
|  | 2008 | 481,093 | 454,186 | 94.41 | 15 | 454,687 | 430,916 | 94.88 | 23,771 | 5.23 |
| Virginia | 2016 | 5,953,612 | 5,604,106 | 94.13 | 22 | 5,604,106 | 5,066,666 | 90.41 | 537,440 | 9.59 |
|  | 2014 | 5,877,485 | 5,280,744 | 89.85 | 18 | 5,280,744 | 4,865,892 | 92.14 | 414,852 | 7.86 |
|  | 2012 | 5,732,827 | 5,428,091 | 94.68 | 10 | 5,428,091 | 4,847,630 | 89.31 | 580,461 | 10.69 |
|  | 2010 | 5,578,950 | 5,032,135 | 90.2 | 22 | 5,032,135 | 4,720,451 | 93.81 | 311,684 | 6.19 |
|  | 2008 | 5,537,581 | 5,034,664 | 90.92 | 22 | 5,034,664 | 4,911,892 | 97.56 | 122,772 | 2.44 |
| Washington | 2016 | 4,937,212 | 4,872,385 | 98.69 | 11 | 4,872,385 | 4,277,499 | 87.79 | 594,886 | 12.21 |
|  | 2014 | 4,866,911 | 3,922,378 | 80.59 | 42 | 4,416,027 | 3,922,378 | 100 | 493,649 | 12.59 |
|  | 2012 | 4,737,815 | 3,904,959 | 82.42 | 41 | 4,319,827 | 3,904,959 | 100 | 414,868 | 10.62 |
|  | 2010 | 4,593,029 | 4,066,517 | 88.54 | 27 | 4,066,517 | 3,601,268 | 88.56 | 465,249 | 11.44 |
|  | 2008 | 4,574,027 | 3,630,118 | 79.36 | 42 | 4,024,335 | 3,630,118 | 100 | 394,217 | 10.86 |
| West Virginia | 2016 | 1,455,848 | 1,254,768 | 86.19 | 42 | 1,254,768 | 1,142,180 | 91.03 | 112,588 | 8.97 |
|  | 2014 | 1,456,966 | 1,213,759 | 83.31 | 35 | 1,213,759 | 1,113,298 | 91.72 | 100,461 | 8.28 |
|  | 2012 | 1,451,004 | 1,246,559 | 85.91 | 37 | 1,246,559 | 1,166,161 | 93.55 | 80,398 | 6.45 |
|  | 2010 | 1,440,478 | 1,216,023 | 84.42 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| NVRA Table 1: Registration History |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Year | CVAP total | Reported registrations | Reported registration \% of CVAP | Ranking of $\%$ of CVAP | Total Active + Inactive Registrations | Active Registrations (total) | Active Registrations (\% of total) | Inactive Registrations (total) | Inactive Registrations (\% of total) |
|  | 2008 | 1,412,127 | 1,212,117 | 85.84 | 36 | 1,212,380 | 1,160,245 | 95.72 | 52,135 | 4.3 |
| Wisconsin | 2016 | 4,294,321 | 3,768,373 | 87.75 | 40 | 3,768,373 | 3,768,373 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 4,269,769 | 3,801,533 | 89.03 | 22 | 3,801,533 | 3,801,533 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 4,215,824 | 3,987,248 | 94.58 | 12 | 3,987,248 | 3,987,248 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 4,160,993 | 3,709,229 | 89.14 | 24 | 3,709,229 | 3,709,229 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 4,167,163 | 4,023,961 | 96.56 | 9 | 3,754,535 | 3,754,535 | 93.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 2016 | 430,026 | 284,203 | 66.09 | 50 | 284,203 | 284,203 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 427,302 | 264,930 | 62 | 50 | 264,930 | 264,930 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 417,624 | 240,438 | 57.57 | 50 | 240,438 | 240,438 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 405,100 | 270,083 | 66.67 | 50 | 270,083 | 270,083 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 391,234 | 244,818 | 62.58 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| U.S. Total | 2016 | 222,469,187 | 214,109,360 | 96.24 | n/a | 204,343,292 | 185,714,229 | 86.74 | 18,629,063 | 8.70 |
|  | 2014 | 222,802,566 | 190,669,639 | 85.58 | n/a | 196,570,199 | 173,518,745 | 91.00 | 23,051,454 | 12.09 |
|  | 2012 | 215,144,520 | 193,653,908 | 90.01 | n/a | 193,576,017 | 170,434,383 | 88.01 | 23,141,634 | 11.95 |
|  | 2010 | 212,989,525 | 186,358,221 | 88.64 | n/a | 191,698,993 | 170,923,470 | 91.72 | 20,775,523 | 11.15 |
|  | 2008 | 211,223,390 | 180,984,324 | 85.68 | n/a | 197,610,942 | 174,101,505 | 96.20 | 23,509,437 | 12.99 |

NVRA Table 1 Calculation Notes
(1) Year is the election year.
(2) CVAP Total is the estimate Citizen Voting Age Population for the state, taken from the U.S. Census Bureau. (3) Reported Registration uses question A1a.
(4) Reported Registration \% of CVAP is calculated using question A1a divided by the state CVAP estimate. (5) Ranking of \% of CVAP ranks states according to the proportion of their CVAP that is registered. (6) Total Active + Inactive Registrations uses questions A3a and A3b. (7) Active Registrations (total) uses question A3a.
(8) Active Registrations (\% of total) uses question A3a divided by A1a.
(9) Inactive Registrations (total) uses question A3b.
(10) Inactive Registrations (\% of total) uses question A3b divided by A1a. General notes: CVAP and calculations using CVAP are not available for U.S. territories. CVAP was taken from U.S. Census Bureau. CVAP is an estimate of the voting age population. Thus, percentages higher than $100 \%$ in the column "Reported registration \% of CVAP" mean that the estimate is smaller than the actual number of registered citizens. The column "Ranking of \% of CVAP" reports how each state compares with the rest in terms of percentage of registered citizens compared with their CVAP. Those states that did not report registrations or CVAP are not included in the ranking. The U.S. total is calculated by adding the information from each state and territory reporting information. Percentages of Active and Inactive registrations may not add up to $100 \%$ as they were calculated based on total registration reported by each state.
American Samoa, District of Columbia, Florida, Guam, Idaho, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming: did not provide information about inactive voters at some point between 2008 and 2016 . In many cases, because the state considers as registered only active voters.
lowa: reported that: "A1a [registered voters], A3a [active voters] numbers are of November 1, 2016, and does not include election day registrations." This was addressed by adding up Same Day Registration data (A4a) to total active voters (A3a) and total registered voters (A1a).
Nebraska: this state reported: "Nebraska does not have "inactive" voters. The numbers in line a3b reflect the number of voters who were sent a section $8(\mathrm{~d})(2)$ notice and have not responded."

> North Dakota: does not have voter registration.

[^0]

| NVRA Table 2a: Application Sources - Total Forms Received |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Applications } \end{gathered}$ | Application Source |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mail, email, fax. |  | In-person |  | Internet |  | Motor Venicle Offices |  | Public AssistanceOffices |  | Disability Services Offices |  | Armed Forces Recruitment Offices |  | Other State Agencies |  | Registration Drives-Advocacy Groups or Parties |  | Other Sources |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Michigan | 2,461,847 | 126,760 | 5.15 | 397,411 | 16.14 | 152,931 | 6.21 | 1,767,560 | 71.8 | 15,564 | 0.63 | 277 | 0.01 | 1,344 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Minnesota | 1,484,767 | 50,324 | 3.39 | 439,547 | 29.6 | 353,621 | 23.82 | 108,781 | 7.33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,671 | 0.99 | 517,812 | 34.88 | 11 | 0.00 |
| Mississippi | 212,780 | 69,258 | 32.55 | 95,193 | 44.74 | 326 | 0.15 | 23,657 | 11.12 | 22,315 | 10.49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,031 | 0.95 | 0 | 0 | 433 | 0.2 | -433 | -0.20 |
| Missouri | 2,133,688 | 237,573 | 11.13 | 89,037 | 4.17 | 25,661 | 1.2 | 288,438 | 13.52 | 67,436 | 3.16 | 541 | 0.03 | 170 | 0.01 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 1,424,718 | 66.77 |
| Montana | 266,402 | 31,006 | 11.64 | 37,822 | 14.2 | 0 | 0 | 56,547 | 21.23 | 12,705 | 4.77 | 363 | 0.14 | 101 | 0.04 | 541 | 0.2 | 14,000 | 5.26 | 113,317 | 42.54 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nebraska | 799,056 | 189,109 | 23.67 | 27,902 | 3.49 | 149,494 | 18.71 | 368,502 | 46.12 | 1,094 | 0.14 | 1,217 | 0.15 | 137 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61,601 | 7.71 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nevada | 716,373 | 61,922 | 8.64 | 134,680 | 18.8 | 155,007 | 21.64 | 136,014 | 18.99 | 50,342 | 7.03 | 1,160 | 0.16 | 62 | 0.01 | 774 | 0.11 | 173,864 | 24.27 | 2,548 | 0.36 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Hampshire | 827,036 | 2,414 | 0.29 | 824,622 | 99.71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Jersey | 1,865,833 | 50,184 | 2.69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 867,555 | 46.5 | 37,478 | 2.01 | 8,381 | 0.45 | 15,488 | 0.83 | 820,261 | 43.96 | 0 | 0 | 66,326 | 3.55 | 160 | 0.01 |
| New Mexico | 337,543 | 14,847 | 4.4 | 35,670 | 10.57 | 106,632 | 31.59 | 49,914 | 14.79 | 12,863 | 3.81 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120,400 | 35.67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2,783 | -0.82 |
| New York | 2,964,829 | 1,104,994 | 37.27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 825,007 | 27.83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103,833 | 3.5 | 44,322 | 1.49 | 0 | 0 | 886,673 | 29.91 |
| North Carolina | 3,330,649 | 741,023 | 22.25 | 1,039,999 | 31.23 | 0 | 0 | 1,108,923 | 33.29 | 80,601 | 2.42 | 3,050 | 0.09 | 21 | 0 | 6,099 | 0.18 | 0 | 0 | 350,933 | 10.54 | 0 | 0.00 |
| North Dakota | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 3,498,036 | 819,906 | 23.44 | 505,461 | 14.45 | 0 | 0 | 1,252,978 | 35.82 | 322,889 | 9.23 | 4,314 | 0.12 | 1,110 | 0.03 | 174,657 | 4.99 | 397,257 | 11.36 | 19,464 | 0.56 | 0 | 0.00 |
| oklahoma | 729,397 | 188,603 | 25.86 | 141,440 | 19.39 | 0 | 0 | 231,263 | 31.71 | 43,481 | 5.96 | 1,453 | 0.2 | 49 | 0.01 | 283 | 0.04 | 0 | 0 | 90,419 | 12.4 | 32,406 | 4.44 |
| Oregon | 1,799,438 | 131,270 | 7.3 | 0 | 0 | 515,604 | 28.65 | 683,103 | 37.96 | 12,582 | 0.7 | 13,580 | 0.75 | 138 | 0.01 | 26,028 | 1.45 | 0 | 0 | 417,101 | 23.18 | 32 | 0.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 4,198,246 | 410,871 | 9.79 | 58,584 | 1.4 | 799,519 | 19.04 | 2,115,232 | 50.38 | 140,673 | 3.35 | 2,370 | 0.06 | 467 | 0.01 | 2,968 | 0.07 | 372,684 | 8.88 | 285,824 | 6.81 | 9,054 | 0.22 |
| Puerto Rico | 307,200 | 0 | 0 | 307,200 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Rhode Island | 144,944 | 24,041 | 16.59 | 18,018 | 12.43 | 15,723 | 10.85 | 70,480 | 48.63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,943 | 10.31 | 1,739 | 1.20 |
| South Carolina | 1,494,527 | 344,820 | 23.07 | 299,539 | 20.04 | 137,005 | 9.17 | 660,513 | 44.2 | 41,043 | 2.75 | 472 | 0.03 | 435 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,700 | 0.72 |
| South Dakota | 154,280 | 27,152 | 17.6 | 8,856 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | 72,811 | 47.19 | 1,101 | 0.71 | 383 | 0.25 | 49 | 0.03 | 3,245 | 2.1 | 6,271 | 4.06 | 0 | 0 | 34,412 | 22.30 |
| Tennessee | 916,435 | 317,426 | 34.64 | 174,128 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 308,015 | 33.61 | 69,758 | 7.61 | 0 | 0 | 6,106 | 0.67 | 15,638 | 1.71 | 0 | 0 | 25,364 | 2.77 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Texas | 5,717,560 | 1,283,244 | 22.44 | 583,992 | 10.21 | 103,728 | 1.81 | 2,413,413 | 42.21 | 237,318 | 4.15 | 3,122 | 0.05 | 39,829 | 0.7 | 78,147 | 1.37 | 1,516 | 0.03 | 502,721 | 8.79 | 470,530 | 8.23 |


NVRA Table 2a Calculation Notes
(1) Total Applications uses question A5a
(2) Mail, Email, Fax, Total uses question A6a
(3) Mail, Email, Fax, Pct uses question A6a divided by question A5a
(4) In-person, Total uses question A6b
(5) In-person, Pct uses question A6b divided by question A5a
(6) Internet, Total uses question A6c
(7) Internet, Pct uses question A6c divided by question A5a
(8) DMV, Total uses question A6d
(10) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Total uses question A6e (11) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Pct uses question A6e divided by question A5a
(12) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Total uses question A6f
(13) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Pct uses question A6f divided by question A5a (14) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Total uses question A6g
(15) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Pct uses question A6g divided by question A5a (16) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Total uses question A6h
(17) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Pct uses question A6h divided by question A5a (18) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Total uses question A6i
(19) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Pct uses question A6i divided by question A 5 a (20) Other, Total uses question A6j, A6k, A6I, A6m, A6n and A6o
(21) Other, Pct uses question A6j, A6k, A6I, A6m, A6n and A6o, all divided by question A5a (22) Not Categorized, Total uses question A5a minus the sum of all question A6 sub-items
(23) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A5a minus the sum of all question A6 sub-items, all divided by A5a
NVRA Table 2a Data Notes
General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the registrations from each source (items A6a to A6o) add up to more registrations than the total applications reported by the state (item A5a).
Connecticut and Guam: both reported receiving $100 \%$ of the registration applications via mail. However, they also broke down the registrations received into the other categories, so that the sum of the registrations reported per source accounts for $200 \%$ of the total registrations in the state/territory.
Idaho: this state reported that: "The Idaho statewide voter registration system does not track how the registration forms are received by the county clerks. Also, Idaho code did not allow for registration cards to be submitted via the internet or email.
Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Minnesota, Montana, Vermont, Virginia and New Jersey: reported FPCA applications or by mail NVRA codes as "Other" (items A6i A6o). These were re-recorded as "Mail" (itemA6a).
lowa: this state offers online voter registration through the Department of Transportation (DOT)
Kentucky, Maryland and Missouri: classified High Schools or Department of Labor as "Other" (items A6i -A60). These were re-recorded as "Other state agencies non-mandated by NVRA" (itemA6h).
Minnesota: recorded "UOCAVA/FPCA online registration" as "Other" (item A6m). This was re-recorded as "Online registration" (item A6c).
New Mexico: the data for the total registrations and the registrations per channel come from different sources and do not completely match.
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
South Carolina: this state reports: "total forms received by source include additions and changes that are processed. System does not allow capture of data on duplicates and incomplete forms"
Utah: did not report the source of the registrations received.
West Virginia: the data reported for "total registrations" per source is well below the expected and is almost the same as that reported for "new valid registrations" (NVRA Table 2b) NVRA and does not receive registrations from NVRA agencies.
Wyoming: forms from voter registration drives were classified as "Other" (item A6j). This item was re-recorded as "Registrations from drives" (item A6i)

| NVRA Table 2b: Application Sources - New Registrations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TotalApplications | Application Source |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mail, email, fax. |  | In-person |  | Internet |  | Motor Venicle Offices |  | Public AssistanceOffices |  | Disability $\operatorname{ser}$ ificesofices |  | Armed Forces RecruitmenOffices |  | Other State Agencies |  | Registration Groups or Parties Drives- AdvocacyGroups or Parties |  | Other Sources |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pet. | Total | Pot. |
| Alabama | 692,167 | 83,878 | 12.12 | 83,683 | 12.09 | 184,230 | 26.62 | 172,276 | 24.89 | 58,919 | 8.51 | 5,025 | 0.73 | 182 | 0.03 | 1,935 | 0.28 | 30,623 | 4.42 | 0 | 0 | 71,416 | 10.32 |
| Alaska | 51,083 | 5,318 | 10.41 | 7,653 | 14.98 | 8,152 | 15.96 | 27,528 | 53.89 | 1,892 | 3.7 | 103 | 0.2 | 249 | 0.49 | 188 | 0.37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Arzona | 689,921 | 42,047 | 6.09 | 4,708 | 0.68 | 225,734 | 32.72 | 301,359 | 43.68 | 5,264 | 0.76 | 465 | 0.07 | 1,163 | 0.17 | 183 | 0.03 | 43,225 | 6.27 | 11,825 | 1.71 | 53,948 | 7.82 |
| Arkansas | 279,286 | 54,001 | 19.34 | 41,846 | 14.98 | 0 | 0 | 151,693 | 54.31 | 19,067 | 6.83 | 166 | 0.06 | 8 | 0 | 1,597 | 0.57 | 6,361 | 2.28 | 4,547 | 1.63 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Calliomia | 3,457,664 | 562,621 | 16.27 | 250,892 | 7.26 | 1,595,415 | 46.14 | 269,108 | 7.78 | 51,242 | 1.48 | 1,954 | 0.06 | 2,428 | 0.07 | 14,934 | 0.43 | 71,968 | 2.08 | 117,465 | 3.4 | 519,637 | 15.03 |
| Colorado | 536,680 | 38,685 | 7.21 | 13,888 | 2.59 | 119,605 | 22.29 | 249,418 | 46.47 | 12,823 | 2.39 | 99 | 0.02 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,112 | 14.55 | 24,043 | 4.48 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 252,904 | 252,904 | 100 | 46,082 | 18.22 | 100,334 | ${ }^{39.67}$ | 23,085 | 9.13 | 4,188 | 1.66 | 193 | 0.08 | 1,289 | ${ }^{0.51}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77,733 | 30.74 | -252,904 | -100.00 |
| Delaware | 80,718 | 3,232 | 4 | 2,452 | 3.04 | 10,609 | 13.14 | 63,084 | 78.15 | 206 | 0.26 | 5 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 0.48 | 743 | 0.92 | - | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 24,345 | 2,836 | 11.65 | 13,288 | 54.58 | 1,555 | 6.39 | 6,180 | 25.39 | 294 | 1.21 | 59 | 0.24 | 6 | 0.02 | 127 | 0.52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Forida | 1,661,699 | 376,575 | 22.66 | 295,651 | 17.79 | 0 | 0 | 825,241 | 49.66 | 15,707 | 0.95 | 1,080 | 0.07 | 376 | 0.02 | 31,576 | 1.9 | 275,560 | 16.58 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | -160,067 | -9.63 |
| Georgia | 712,035 | 152,092 | 21.36 | 39,049 | 5.48 | 154,104 | 21.64 | 319,381 | 44.85 | 19,777 | 2.78 | 22,006 | 3.09 | 36 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,590 | 0.79 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 8,608 | 8,858 | 102.9 | 8,453 | 98.2 | 405 | 4.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -9,108 | -105.81 |
| Hawail | 82,565 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,724 | 29.94 | 24,233 | 29.35 | 3,109 | 3.77 | 76 | 0.09 | 971 | 1.18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,979 | 35.1 | 473 | 0.57 |
| Idaho | 109,705 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 109,705 | 100.00 |
| IIIInois | 1,318,925 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1,318,925 | 100.00 |
| Indiana | 416,227 | 30,117 | 7.24 | 4,510 | 1.08 | 118,177 | 28.39 | 181,225 | 43.54 | 11,181 | 2.69 | 128 | 0.03 | 132 | 0.03 | 19 | 0 | 5,085 | 1.22 | 65,653 | 15.77 | 0 | 0.00 |
| lowa | 151,589 | 17,251 | 11.38 | 36,807 | 24.28 | 0 | 0 | 77,575 | 51.17 | 1,568 | 1.03 | 39 | 0.03 | 29 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 13,066 | 8.62 | 5,254 | 3.47 |
| Kansas | 226,854 | 21,743 | 9.58 | 29,470 | 12.99 | 43,251 | 19.07 | 115,627 | 50.97 | 655 | 0.29 | 17 | 0.01 | 29 | 0.01 | 180 | 0.08 | 10,024 | 4.42 | 4,312 | 1.9 | 1.546 | 0.68 |
| Kentucky | 242,278 | 9,637 | 3.98 | 39,696 | 16.38 | 37,175 | 15.34 | 140,797 | 58.11 | 6,873 | 2.84 | 930 | 0.38 | 154 | 0.06 | 6,365 | 2.63 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 651 | 0.27 |
| Louisiana | 369,879 | 67,685 | 18.3 | 35,255 | 9.53 | 138,009 | 37.31 | 114,472 | 30.95 | 9,408 | 2.54 | 1,830 | 0.49 | 890 | 0.24 | 0 | 0 | 2,330 | 0.63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maine | 95,367 | 5,338 | 5.6 | 76,764 | 80.49 | 0 | 0 | 1,570 | 1.65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,116 | 7.46 | 4,579 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 382,980 | 33,804 | 8.83 | 5,669 | 1.48 | 75,245 | 19.65 | 242,455 | 63.31 | 11,622 | 3.03 | 293 | 0.08 | 74 | 0.02 | 2,641 | 0.69 | 0 | 0 | 26,530 | 6.93 | -15,353 | -4.01 |
| Massachusetts | 487,479 | 82,426 | 16.91 | 53,780 | 11.03 | 141,755 | 29.08 | 186,621 | 38.28 | 20,199 | 4.14 | 1,286 | 0.26 | 0 | 0 | 1,319 | 0.27 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0.02 | 1 | 0.00 |



NVRA Table 2b Calculation Notes
(1) Total Applications uses question A5b
(2) Mail, Email, Fax, Total uses question A7a
(3) Mail, Email, Fax, Pct uses question A7a divided by question A5b (4) In-person, Total uses question A7b
(5) In-person, Pct uses question A7b divided by question A5b
(6) Internet, Total uses question A7c
(7) Internet, Pct uses question A7c divided by question A5b (8) DMV, Total uses question A7d
(9) DMV, Pct uses question A7d divided by question A5b
(10) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Total uses question A7e
(11) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Pct uses question A7e divided by question A5b
(12) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Total uses question A7f
(13) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Pct uses question A7f divided by question A5b (14) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Total uses question A7g
(15) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Pct uses question A7g divided by question A5b (16) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Total uses question A7h
(17) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Pct uses question A7h divided by question A5b (18) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Total uses question A7i
(19) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Pct uses question A7i divided by question A5b
(20) Other, Total uses question A7j, A7k, A71, A7m, A7n and A70
(21) Other, Pct uses question A7j, A7k, A7l, A7m, A7n and A70, all divided by question A5b
(22) Not Categorized, Total uses question A5b minus the sum of all question A7 sub-items
(23) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A5b minus the sum of all question A7 sub-items, all divided by A5b
NVRA Table 2b Data Notes
General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the registrations from each source (items A7a to A7o) add up to more registrations than the total valid applications reported by the state (item A5b).
Connecticut and Guam: both reported receiving about 100\% of their new valid registration applications via mail. However, they also broke down the registrations received into the other categories, so that the sum of the registrations reported per source accounts for about $200 \%$ of the total new registrations in the state/ territory.
Nebraska, Minnesota, Montana, Vermont, Virginia and some jurisdictions in Texas: reported FPCA applications as "Other" (items A7i -A7o). These were rerecorded as "Mail" (itemA7a).
Idaho: this state reported that: "The Idaho statewide voter registration system does not track how the registration forms are received by the county clerks. Also, Idaho code did not allow for registration cards to be submitted via the internet or email.
Illinois, New York and Utah: these states did not report the registration source for new valid registrations.
Kentucky and Maryland: classified High Schools as "Other" (items A7i -A70). These were re-recorded as "Other state agencies non-mandated by NVRA" (itemA7h). Minnesota: recorded "UOCAVA/FPCA online registration" as "Other" (item A7m). This was re-recorded as "Online registration" (item A7c).
New Mexico: the data for the total new valid registrations and data for the new valid registrations per channel come from different sources and do not completely match. For seven jurisdictions, the total number of registrations (item A5a) was filled with the sum of items A5b to A5I.
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
South Dakota: only a few jurisdictions reported information about source of new valid registrations. Wisconsin: this state reported: "We cannot pull both the registration type and the registration source"
Wyoming: forms from voter registration drives were classified as "Other" (item A7j). This item was re-recorded as "Registrations from drives" (item A7i)



NVRA Table 2c Calculation Notes
(1) Total Applications uses question A5d
(2) Mail, Email, Fax, Total uses question A8a
(3) Mail, Email, Fax, Pct uses question A8a divided by question A5d
(4) In-person, Total uses question A8b
(5) In-person, Pct uses question A8b divided by question A5d
(6) Internet, Total uses question A8c
(7) Internet, Pct uses question A8c divided by question A5d
(8) DMV, Total uses question A8d
(10) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Total uses question A8e (11) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Pct uses question A8e divided by question A5d
(12) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Total uses question A8f
(13) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Pct uses question A8f divided by question A5d (14) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Total uses question A8g
(15) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Pct uses question A8g divided by question A5d (16) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Total uses question A8h
(17) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Pct uses question A8h divided by question A5d (18) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Total uses question A8i (20) Other, Total uses question A8j, A8k, A81, A8m, A8n and A8o
(19) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Pct uses question A8i divided by question A5d
(21) Other, Pct uses question A8j, A8k, A8I, A8m, A8n and A80, all divided by question A5d (22) Not Categorized, Total uses question A5d minus the sum of all question A8 sub-items (23) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A5d minus the sum of all question A8 sub-items, all divided by A5d
NVRA Table 2c Data Notes
General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the duplicate registrations from each source (items A8a to A80) add up to more registrations than the total duplicate registrations reported by the state (item A5d).
Connecticut, Guam, Idaho, Mississippi, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, West Virginia and Wisconsin: did not report any duplicate registrations.
Illinois, Kansas and Kentucky: did not break down duplicate registrations per source of registration.
Indiana, Nebraska, Minnesota and Montana: reported FPCA duplicate applications as "Other" (items A8i-A80). These were re-recorded as "Mail" (itemA8a). Maryland: classified duplicate registrations from High Schools as "Other" (items A8I). These were re-recorded as "Other state agencies non-mandated by NVRA" (itemA8h).
Minnesota: recorded "UOCAVA/FPCA online registration" duplicate registrations as "Other" (item A8m). This was re-recorded as "Online registration" (item A8c). North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
New Jersey: this state reported: "07/2015 system started recording duplicate transactions."
Wyoming: does not report duplicate registrations because: "our voter registration system alerts when entering a registration whether or not the voter already exists in the system. This prevents duplicate registrations."

| NVRA Table 2d: Application Sources - Invalid or Rejected Forms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Applications } \end{gathered}$ | Application Source |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mail, email, fax. |  | In-person |  | Internet |  | Motor Vehicle Offices |  | Public AssistanceOffices |  | Disability Services Offices |  | Armed Forces Recruitment Offices |  | Other State Agencies |  | Registration DrivesAdvocacy Groups or Parties |  | Other Sources |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Alabama | 11,306 | 922 | 8.15 | 306 | 2.71 | 351 | 3.1 | 1,513 | 13.38 | 2,085 | 18.44 | 1,152 | 10.19 | 5 | 0.04 | 626 | 5.54 | 1,135 | 10.04 | 0 | 0 | 3,211 | 28.40 |
| Alaska | 6,420 | 1,000 | 15.58 | 1,310 | 20.4 | 884 | 13.77 | 2,392 | 37.26 | 721 | 11.23 | 12 | 0.19 | 79 | 1.23 | 22 | 0.34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Arizona | 29,325 | 5,856 | 19.97 | 249 | 0.85 | 2,224 | 7.58 | 281 | 0.96 | 967 | 3.3 | 356 | 1.21 | 22 | 0.07 | 8,578 | 29.25 | 6,121 | 20.87 | 4,217 | 14.38 | 454 | 1.55 |
| Arkansas | 9,766 | 872 | 8.93 | 815 | 8.35 | 0 | 0 | 8,819 | 90.3 | 176 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.05 | 107 | 1.1 | 17 | 0.17 | -1,045 | -10.70 |
| California | 651,320 | 87,779 | 13.48 | 61,858 | 9.5 | 156,598 | 24.04 | 48,989 | 7.52 | 13,500 | 2.07 | 419 | 0.06 | 336 | 0.05 | 638 | 0.1 | 18,976 | 2.91 | 178,657 | 27.43 | 83,570 | 12.83 |
| Colorado | 18,309 | 2,668 | 14.57 | 258 | 1.41 | 1,809 | 9.88 | 3,335 | 18.22 | 1,733 | 9.47 | 2 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,355 | 45.63 | 149 | 0.81 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| Delaware | 6,620 | 323 | 4.88 | 285 | 4.31 | 988 | 14.92 | 4,877 | 73.67 | 49 | 0.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0.26 | 81 | 1.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 123 | 43 | 34.96 | 49 | 39.84 | 4 | 3.25 | 21 | 17.07 | 2 | 1.63 | 3 | 2.44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Florida | 106,360 | 19,992 | 18.8 | 14,564 | 13.69 | 0 | 0 | 10,116 | 9.51 | 2,756 | 2.59 | 243 | 0.23 | 20 | 0.02 | 1,393 | 1.31 | 57,274 | 53.85 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.00 |
| Georgia | 2,095 | 2,054 | 98.04 | 17 | 0.81 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.05 | 1 | 0.05 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0.95 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 130 | 250 | 192.31 | 130 | 100 | 120 | 92.31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -370 | -284.62 |
| Hawail | 11,342 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,342 | 100.00 |
| Idaho | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Illinois | 46,552 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46,552 | 100.00 |
| Indiana | 29,396 | 1,169 | 3.98 | 5 | 0.02 | 1,884 | 6.41 | 7,933 | 26.99 | 985 | 3.35 | 12 | 0.04 | 5 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,403 | 59.2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| lowa | 916 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 916 | 100.00 |
| Kansas | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| Kentucky | 496,315 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496,315 | 100.00 |
| Louisiana | 20,645 | 12,526 | 60.67 | 145 | 0.7 | 1,955 | 9.47 | 3,145 | 15.23 | 2,393 | 11.59 | 301 | 1.46 | 5 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 0.85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maine | 1,079 | 79 | 7.32 | 2 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0.93 | 986 | 91.38 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 591 | 133 | 22.5 | 13 | 2.2 | 30 | 5.08 | 213 | 36.04 | 54 | 9.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.34 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 24.7 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Massachusetts | 16,892 | 2,374 | 14.05 | 432 | 2.56 | 5,193 | 30.74 | 8,103 | 47.97 | 709 | 4.2 | 44 | 0.26 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.00 |



| NVRA Table 2d: Application Sources - Invalid or Rejected Forms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Applications } \end{gathered}$ | Application Source |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mail, email, fax. |  | In-person |  | Internet |  | Motor Vehicle Offices |  | Public Assistance Offices |  | Disability Services Offices |  | Armed Forces <br> Recruitment Offices |  | Other State Agencies |  | Registration DrivesAdvocacy Groups or Parties |  | Other Sources |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Utah | 37,251 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37,251 | 100.00 |
| Vermont | 849 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 34.98 | 552 | 65.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Virginia | 106,959 | 17,380 | 16.25 | 3,407 | 3.19 | 7,336 | 6.86 | 52,961 | 49.52 | 1,361 | 1.27 | 53 | 0.05 | 5 | 0 | 875 | 0.82 | 22,952 | 21.46 | 360 | 0.34 | 269 | 0.25 |
| Washington | 7,738 | 1,775 | 22.94 | 27 | 0.35 | 1,313 | 16.97 | 1,095 | 14.15 | 809 | 10.45 | 4 | 0.05 | 296 | 3.83 | 76 | 0.98 | 1,846 | 23.86 | 439 | 5.67 | 58 | 0.75 |
| West Virginia | 261 | 107 | 41 | 60 | 22.99 | 44 | 16.86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 19.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Wisconsin | 501 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 501 | 100.00 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| U.S. Total | 2,320,995 | 347,528 | 14.97 | 161,296 | 6.95 | 191,153 | 8.24 | 346,398 | 14.92 | 95,686 | 4.12 | 9,579 | 0.41 | 1,241 | 0.05 | 30,497 | 1.31 | 187,303 | 8.07 | 230,480 | 9.93 | 719,834 | 31.01 |

NVRA Table 2d Calculation Notes
(2) Mail, Email, Fax, Total uses question A9a
(3) Mail, Email, Fax, Pct uses question A9a divided by question A5e
(4) In-person, Total uses question A9b
(5) In-person, Pct uses question A9b divided by question A5e
(6) Internet, Total uses question A9c
(7) Internet, Pct uses question A9c divided by question A5e
(8) DMV, Total uses question A9d
(9) DMV, Pct uses question A9d divided by question A5e
(10) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Total uses question A9e
(11) Public Assistance Offices Mandated per NVRA, Pct uses question A9e divided by question A5e
(12) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Total uses question A9f
(13) State Funded Agencies Primarily Serving Persons with Disabilities, Pct uses question A9f divided by question A5e (14) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Total uses question A9g
(15) Armed Forces Recruitment offices, Pct uses question A9g divided by question A5e (16) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Total uses question A9h
(17) Agencies Designated by the State not Mandated by NVRA, Pct uses question A9h divided by question A5e (18) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Total uses question A9i
(19) Registration Drives or Political Parties, Pct uses question A9i divided by question A5e
(20) Other, Total uses question A9j, A9k, A91, A9m, A9n and A9o
(21) Other, Pct uses question A9j, A9k, A91, A9m, A9n and A9o all divided by question A5e (22) Not Categorized, Total uses question A5e minus the sum of all question A9 sub-items
(23) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A5e minus the sum of all question A9 sub-items, all divided by A5e
NVRA Table 2d Data Notes
General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the rejected applications from each source (items A9a to A9o) add up to more applications than the total rejected applications reported by the state (item A5e).
Connecticut, Idaho, Kansas, New Hampshire, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, U.S. Virgin Islands and Wyoming: did not report information about invalid or rejected applications.
Hawaii, Illinois, lowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, Utah, Vermont and Wisconsin: did not break down duplicate registrations per source of registration. Indiana and Montana: reported FPCA applications or by mail NVRA codes as "Other" (items A9i-A9o). These were re-recorded as "Mail" (itemA9a). North Dakota: does not have voter registration.


| NVRA Table 3: Registration Applications Processed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Reported Registrations | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Registration } \\ \text { Forms } \\ \text { Received } \end{gathered}$ | Registration Category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Change of Name, Party or Address (within Jurisdiction) |  | Change of Address (Cross-Jurisdiction) |  | Duplicate |  | Invalid or Rejected |  | Other |  | Not Categorized |  | New Valid Registrations |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Massachusetts | 4,534,974 | 1,678,290 | 540,601 | 32.21 | 457,834 | 27.28 | 173,214 | 10.32 | 16,892 | 1.01 | 2,270 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 487,479 | 29.05 |
| Michigan | 7,514,055 | 2,461,847 | 819,631 | 33.29 | 0 | 0 | 194,166 | 7.89 | 1,032 | 0.04 | 18,357 | 0.75 | 6 | 0 | 1,428,655 | 58.03 |
| Minnesota | 3,473,972 | 1,484,767 | 491,906 | 33.13 | 294,028 | 19.8 | 212,956 | 14.34 | 316 | 0.02 | 6,329 | 0.43 | 0 | 0 | 479,232 | 32.28 |
| Mississippi | 2,072,395 | 212,780 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442 | 0.21 | 10,447 | 4.91 | 0 | 0 | 201,891 | 94.88 |
| Missouri | 4,215,860 | 2,133,688 | 1,507,052 | 70.63 | 0 | 0 | 2,835 | 0.13 | 3,230 | 0.15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 620,571 | 29.08 |
| Montana | 694,370 | 266,402 | 135,868 | 51 | 55,472 | 20.82 | 4,205 | 1.58 | 419 | 0.16 | 1,452 | 0.55 | 0 | 0 | 68,986 | 25.90 |
| Nebraska | 1,211,101 | 799,056 | 580,611 | 72.66 | 0 | 0 | 39,556 | 4.95 | 320 | 0.04 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178,569 | 22.35 |
| Nevada | 1,678,883 | 716,373 | 409,951 | 57.23 | 121 | 0.02 | 15,662 | 2.19 | 34,099 | 4.76 | 6,840 | 0.95 | 0 | 0 | 249,700 | 34.86 |
| New Hampshire | 988,398 | 827,036 | 597,039 | 72.19 | 99,629 | 12.05 | 1,414 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128,932 | 15.59 |
| New Jersey | 5,751,090 | 1,865,833 | 1,240,224 | 66.47 | 0 | 0 | 21,576 | 1.16 | 6,515 | 0.35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597,518 | 32.02 |
| New Mexico | 1,289,420 | 337,543 | 229,586 | 68.02 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 0.1 | 14,678 | 4.35 | 345 | 0.1 | -52,199 | -15.46 | 144,802 | 42.90 |
| New York | 16,200,892 | 2,964,829 | 333,156 | 11.24 | 285,744 | 9.64 | 219,880 | 7.42 | 103,486 | 3.49 | 0 | 0 | 492,308 | 16.6 | 1,530,255 | 51.61 |
| North Carolina | 6,924,469 | 3,330,649 | 1,115,792 | 33.5 | 0 | 0 | 837,948 | 25.16 | 145,667 | 4.37 | 139 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 1,231,105 | 36.96 |
| North Dakota | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Ohio | 7,861,025 | 3,498,036 | 1,580,506 | 45.18 | 0 | 0 | 652,921 | 18.67 | 70,666 | 2.02 | 16,967 | 0.48 | 0 | 0 | 1,176,976 | 33.65 |
| Oklahoma | 2,157,450 | 729,397 | 310,713 | 42.6 | 0 | 0 | 1,216 | 0.17 | 28,097 | 3.85 | 0 | 0 | 3,003 | 0.41 | 386,368 | 52.97 |
| Oregon | 2,553,810 | 1,799,438 | 1,245,219 | 69.2 | 0 | 0 | 2,077 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 33,649 | 1.87 | 0 | 0 | 518,493 | 28.81 |
| Pennsylvania | 8,722,975 | 4,198,246 | 1,677,855 | 39.97 | 723,890 | 17.24 | 316,875 | 7.55 | 97,811 | 2.33 | 0 | 0 | 441,182 | 10.51 | 940,633 | 22.41 |
| Puerto Rico | 2,867,558 | 307,200 | 0 | 0 | 129,054 | 42.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0.04 | 0 | 0 | 178,032 | 57.95 |
| Rhode Island | 754,065 | 144,944 | 53,854 | 37.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,863 | 3.36 | 0 | 0 | 86,227 | 59.49 |
| South Carolina | 3,157,027 | 1,494,527 | 1,271,114 | 85.05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223,413 | 14.95 |
| South Dakota | 595,322 | 154,280 | 68,196 | 44.2 | 24,040 | 15.58 | 46,064 | 29.86 | 23 | 0.01 | 1,388 | 0.9 | -44,486 | $-28.83$ | 59,055 | 38.28 |


NVRA Table 3 Calculation Notes
(1) Total Reported Registrations uses question A1a
(2) Total Registration Forms Received uses question A5a
(3) Change of Name, Party or Address (Within Jurisdiction), Total uses question A5f
(4) Change of Name, Party or Address (Within Jurisdiction), Pct uses question A5f divided by question A5a
(5) Change of Address (Cross-Jurisdiction), Total uses question A5g
(6) Change of Address (Cross-Jurisdiction), Pct uses question A5g divided by question A5a
(7) Duplicate, Total uses question A5d
(8) Duplicate, Pct uses question A5d divided by question A5a
(9) Invalid or Rejected, Total uses question A5e
(10) Invalid or Rejected, Pct uses question A5e divided by question A5a
(11) Other, Total uses the sum of questions A5c, A5h, A5i, A5j, A5k and A5I
(12) Other, Pct uses the sum of questions $A 5 c, A 5 h, A 5 i, A 5 j, A 5 k$ and $A 5 I$ divided by question $A 5 a$
(13) Not Categorized, Total uses question A5a minus the sum of questions A5b, A5c, A5h, A5i, A5j, A5k and A5I
(14) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A5a minus the sum of questions A5b, A5c, A5h, A5i, A5j, A5k and A5I, all divided by question A5a (15) New Valid Registrations, Total uses question A5b (16) \% Applications Received Added to List, Pct uses question A5b divided by A5a
NVRA Table 3 Data Notes

[^1]New Mexico: the data for total registrations and data for registrations per category come from different sources and do not completely match. Most jurisdictions did not provide information for "Duplicate registrations" (item A5d) and "Invalid or rejected registrations" (item A5e). These were re-recorded with the data provided in items A7a to A7o (for item A5b), and items A9a to A90 (for item A5e). Additionally, seven jurisdictions did not report the total number of registrations (item A5a), which was filled with the sum of items A5b to A5I.
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
South Carolina: only reported "New Registrations" (item A5b) and "Changes to Name/Address" (item A5f). As reported by the state: "A5a shows total records marked as a new registration or change. Changes include any change to the voter's record. Complete data for duplicate and incomplete applications $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$." Vermont: did not report information about "New Registrations" (A5b) and "Duplicate Registrations" (A5d). These items were re-recorded with the sum of the data reported in items A7a to A7o (for item A5b), and items A8a to A80 (for item A5d).
West Virginia: does not report address changes within/cross-jurisdiction separately, and does not track duplicates.
Wisconsin: does not follow NVRA and does not collect information of duplicate and rejected registrations.

| NVRA Table 4a: Voter List Maintenance - Confirmation Notices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Confirmation Notices Sent |  | Result of Confirmation Notice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Received Confirmation From Voter |  |  |  | Confirmation Returned as Undeliverable |  | Status Unknown |  | Other |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  |  | Valid |  | Invalid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Pct. Active Voters | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Alabama | 253,316 | 8.31 | 1,790 | 0.71 | 39,012 | 15.4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212,511 | 83.89 |
| Alaska | 24,835 | 4.7 | 837 | 3.37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,998 | 96.63 |
| Arizona | 578,631 | 16.12 | 122,599 | 21.19 | 43,266 | 7.48 | 278,619 | 48.15 | 118,611 | 20.5 | 149 | 0.03 | 15,387 | 2.66 |
| Arkansas | 403,725 | 28.38 | 114,588 | 28.38 | 31,119 | 7.71 | 56,802 | 14.07 | 201,216 | 49.84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| California | 1,423,191 | 7.32 | 136,335 | 9.58 | 130,063 | 9.14 | 126,225 | 8.87 | 660,569 | 46.41 | 107,264 | 7.54 | 262,735 | 18.46 |
| Colorado | 461,029 | 13.82 | 19,933 | 4.32 | 6,780 | 1.47 | 0 | 0 | 434,316 | 94.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 55,023 | 2.54 | 39,757 | 72.26 | 1,096 | 1.99 | 14,170 | 25.75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Delaware | 29,442 | 4.58 | 5,352 | 18.18 | 18,739 | 63.65 | 554 | 1.88 | 4,797 | 16.29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Florida | 1,109,098 | 8.63 | 270,447 | 24.38 | 39,649 | 3.57 | 252,340 | 22.75 | 533,445 | 48.1 | 12,683 | 1.14 | 534 | 0.05 |
| Georgia | 1,026,062 | 18.78 | 65,022 | 6.34 | 4,234 | 0.41 | 270,797 | 26.39 | 686,009 | 66.86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 5,218 | 10.09 | 5,218 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Hawaii | 41,120 | 6.17 | 2,749 | 6.69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38,371 | 93.31 |
| Idaho | 35,180 | 3.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,180 | 100.00 |
| Illinois | 648,722 | 8.05 | 43,943 | 6.77 | 24,659 | 3.8 | 183,048 | 28.22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397,072 | 61.21 |
| Indiana | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Iowa | 112,535 | 5.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60,803 | 54.03 | 0 | 0 | 51,732 | 45.97 |
| Kansas | 211,769 | 13.22 | 9,548 | 4.51 | 38,376 | 18.12 | 18,728 | 8.84 | 143,201 | 67.62 | 0 | 0 | 1,916 | 0.90 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Louisiana | 331,301 | 11.46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331,301 | 100.00 |
| Maine | 110 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.45 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 69.09 | 28 | 25.45 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 773,802 | 19.84 | 9,233 | 1.19 | 29,119 | 3.76 | 0 | 0 | 705,493 | 91.17 | 0 | 0 | 29,957 | 3.87 |



| NVRA Table 4a: Voter List Maintenance - Confirmation Notices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Confirmation Notices Sent |  | Result of Confirmation Notice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Received Confirmation From Voter |  |  |  | Confirmation Returned as Undeliverable |  | Status Unknown |  | Other |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  |  | Valid |  | Invalid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Pct. Active Voters | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Tennessee | 457,472 | 12.94 | 83,242 | 18.2 | 5,119 | 1.12 | 72,941 | 15.94 | 296,170 | 64.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Texas | 1,623,778 | 13.6 | 187,441 | 11.54 | 25,773 | 1.59 | 206,128 | 12.69 | 1,023,365 | 63.02 | 17,910 | 1.1 | 163,161 | 10.05 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 8,170 | 17.73 | 0 | 0 | 1,600 | 19.58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,570 | 80.42 |
| Utah | 66,583 | 4.71 | 4,545 | 6.83 | 0 | 0 | 3,723 | 5.59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58,315 | 87.58 |
| Vermont | 17,385 | 3.95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,385 | 100.00 |
| Virginia | 566,128 | 11.17 | 127,950 | 22.6 | 0 | 0 | 33,056 | 5.84 | 405,122 | 71.56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 499,688 | 11.68 | 118,202 | 23.66 | 121,435 | 24.3 | 31,422 | 6.29 | 218,452 | 43.72 | 0 | 0 | 10,177 | 2.04 |
| West Virginia | 70,804 | 6.2 | 2,954 | 4.17 | 15,511 | 21.91 | 1,860 | 2.63 | 50,479 | 71.29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| Wyoming | 46,039 | 16.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46,039 | 100.00 |
| U.S. Total | 19,058,066 | 10.26 | 2,434,463 | 12.77 | 834,005 | 4.38 | 2,534,257 | 13.3 | 8,955,111 | 46.99 | 436,001 | 2.29 | 3,864,229 | 20.28 |

NVRA Table 4a Calculation Notes
(1) Total Confirmation Notices Sent uses question A10a
(2) \% of Active Voters uses question $s \backslash A 10$ a divided by question A3a
(3) Received Confirmation from Voter - Valid, Total uses question A10b
(4) Received Confirmation from Voter - Valid, Pct uses question A10b divided by A10a
(6) Received Confimation from Vor - Invalid, Pct uses question A10c aividea by A1Oa
(6) Received Confirmation from Voter - Invalid, Pct uses question A10c divided by A10a
(7) Confirmation Returned as Undeliverable, Total uses question A10d
(8) Confirmation Returned as Undeliverable, Pct uses question A10d divided by question A10a
(9) Status Unknown, Total uses question A10e
(10) Status Unknown, Pct uses question A10e divided by question A10a
(11) Other, Total uses question A10f, A10g and A10h
(12) Other, Pct uses the sum of question A10f, A10g and A10h divided by question A10a
(13) Not Categorized, Total uses question A10a minus the sum of all A10 sub-items
(14) Not Categorized, Pct uses question A10a minus the sum of all A10 sub-items, all divided by question A10a
General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the confirmation notices for each category (items A10b to A10h) add up to more confirmation notices than those reported in the total (item A10a).
Idaho: this state reports about information regarding confirmation notices: "this figure only includes the number of notices mailed to voters for being purged for not voting in the last two federal primary and general elections. Idaho law does not require cancellation notices to be mailed to voters except for purging."
Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont and Wyoming: report number of confirmation notices sent but do not break them down in categories.
District of Columbia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Puerto Rico and Rhode Island: did not report information about confirmation notices.
Minnesota: this state reports that: "Minnesota is NVRA exempt. Minnesota sends a notice if a registration will be inactivated because of an NCOA or ERIC out-ofstate move.
North Dakota: does not have voter registration.
Wisconsin: this state reports: "Wisconsin is exempt from NVRA and does not send these types of confirmation notices"



| NVRA Table 4b: Voter List Maintenance - Removal Actions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voters Removed |  | Reason for Removal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pct. } \\ \text { Registered } \\ \text { Voters } \end{gathered}$ | Moved out of Juristiction |  | Death |  | Failure to Return Confirmation Notice |  | Voter's Request |  | Felony or Conviction |  | Mental Incompetence |  | Other |  | Not Categorized |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pot. | Total | Pot. |
| U.S. Virgín slands | 8,170 | 15.92 | 0 | 0 | 507 | 6.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 1.49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,541 | 92.30 |
| Utah | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Vermont | 36,479 | 8.21 | 6,101 | 16.72 | 4,422 | 12.12 | 12,929 | 35.44 | 6,179 | 16.94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,848 | 18.77 |
| Virginia | 808,079 | 15.30 | 535,654 | 66.29 | 92,058 | 11.39 | 135,400 | 16.76 | 12,294 | 1.52 | 26,756 | 3.31 | 955 | 0.12 | 4,962 | 0.61 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 476,266 | 12.14 | 198,650 | 41.71 | 56,393 | 11.84 | 14,545 | 3.05 | 10,622 | 2.23 | 4,965 | 1.04 | 107 | 0.02 | 190,984 | 40.1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| West Virginia | 76,487 | 6.30 | 6,862 | 8.97 | 28,474 | 37.23 | 23,551 | 30.79 | 46 | 0.06 | 306 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.01 | 17,242 | 22.54 | 1 | 0.00 |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| wyoming | 51,771 | 19.54 | 1,494 | 2.89 | 4,505 | 8.7 | 45,567 | 88.02 | 48 | 0.09 | 98 | 0.19 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 0.07 | 22 | 0.04 |
| U.S. Total | 16,696,470 | 8.76 | 5,188,806 | 31.08 | 4,110,047 | 24.62 | 4,358,065 | 26.1 | 299,717 | 1.8 | 334,253 | 2 | 10,644 | 0.06 | 1,347,664 | 8.07 | 1,047,274 | 6.27 |

NVRA Table 4b Calculation Notes

## (1) Voters Removed uses question A11a

(2) \% of Reported Registrations uses question A11a divided by total registrations in 2014 (A1a from 2014) (3) Moved out of Jurisdictions, Total uses question A11b
(4) Moved out of Jurisdictions, Pct uses question A11b divided by question A1a
(5) Death of Registrant, Total uses question A11c
(6) Death of Registrant, Pct uses question A11 divided by question A1a

## (7) Voter's Request, Total uses question A11g

(8) Voter's Request, Pct uses question A11g divided by question A1a
(9) Felony or Conviction, Total uses question A11d
(10) Felony or Conviction, Pct uses question A11d divided by question A1a
(11) Mental Incompetence, Total uses question A11f
(12) Mental Incompetence, Total uses question A11f divided by question A1a
(13) Other, Total uses the sum of questions A11h, A11i, A11j and A11k
(14) Other, Pct uses the sum of questions A11h, A11i, A11j and A11k divided by question A1a
(15) Not Categorized, Total uses question A11a minus the sum of all A11 sub-items
(16) Not Categorized, Total uses question A11a minus the sum of all A11 sub-items, all divided by question A11a

## NVRA Table 4b Data Notes

General note: the percent of registered voters removed from the rolls was calculated using the number of registered citizens in 2014. So the percentage shows what percentage of those citizens registered in 2014 were removed leading to the 2016 Presidential Election.
Colorado: this state reports: "the relocation outside of jurisdiction includes only moved out of state. Under Colorado law, if a voter moves within the state his or her record is transferred in the statewide database to the new county."
 (item A11b)
Minnesota: this state reports: "[For items] A11d and A11f: voter is not removed but status changes to "challenged." [For item] A11e: Did not vote or update registration in prior four years. [For item] A11g: Voter request not tracked separately is included in A11h."
Nebraska: this state reports: "Nebraska does not completely remove any voter from the voter registration application. The numbers in [item] A11 represent voters who were put into a "removable" or "not eligible" status, but their voter record history is still in the database."
New York and Utah: did not report information about voter removal.
Wisconsin: this state reported: "data on the total voters removed and the reasons for removal is not available due to a system migration" Wyoming: this state reports: "our office now receives data from the department of transportation that flags potential noncitizens. If a potential noncitizen did not confirm their eligibility, they were removed from the rolls."

| NVRA Table 5: Same Day Registration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New Same Day Registrations |  |  |
|  | Total | Pct. Reported Registration (only states with SDR) | Pct. Applications Received |
| Alaska | 4,809 | 0.82 | 1.86 |
| Arizona | 4 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Colorado | 19,190 | 0.5 | 1.21 |
| Connecticut | 34,929 | 1.5 | 3.51 |
| District of Columbia | 9,836 | 1.99 | 5.79 |
| Hawaii | 2,632 | 0.35 | 1.18 |
| Idaho | 131,455 | 14.04 | 43.40 |
| Illinois | 137,757 | 1.56 | 6.16 |
| Iowa | 51,215 | 2.3 | 7.58 |
| Maine | 74,270 | 6.97 | 25.94 |
| Maryland | 7,884 | 0.2 | 0.40 |
| Minnesota | 197,552 | 5.69 | 13.31 |
| Montana | 12,055 | 1.74 | 4.53 |
| Nebraska | 1,237 | 0.1 | 0.15 |
| New Hampshire | 80,995 | 8.19 | 9.79 |
| North Carolina | 119,035 | 1.72 | 3.57 |
| Rhode Island | 7,001 | 0.93 | 4.83 |
| Texas | 10,045 | 0.07 | 0.18 |
| Utah | 10,272 | 0.65 | 1.55 |
| Vermont | 1,546 | 0.33 | 1.75 |
| Wisconsin | 355,948 | 9.45 | 54.68 |
| Wyoming | 19,911 | 7.01 | 8.35 |
| U.S. Total | 1,289,578 | 2.03 | 5.16 |

NVRA Table 5 Calculation Notes
(1) Total New Same Day Registrations uses question A4a
(2) \% of Reported Registrations uses question A4a divided by question A1a
(3) \% of Total Applications Received uses question A4a divided by question A5a

## NVRA Table 5 Data Notes

General note: this table only includes those states that provided any data about Same Day Registration (SDR).
Alaska: the law in this state allows for same day voter registration for the office of president/vice president only.
Arizona and Texas: do not have Same Day Registration. However, some jurisdictions reported allowing some individuals to register on a day when voting was also occurring. For example, the jurisdiction of Gila, AZ reported: "UOCAVA voters are allowed to register and vote on Election Day."

Hawaii: "Same day registration was offered during early voting only"
Nebraska: this state reports an overlap between close of registration and opening of early voting. Rhode Island: only allows same day registration for president and vice president.
Vermont: this state reports: "all of Vermont, allowed SDR thorough affirmation form when DMV application form was not received."
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## UNIFORMED AND OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT (UOCAVA) <br> SURVEY FINDINGS



## Introduction

The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, or UOCAVA, was enacted to improve the voting process for the more than 1.3 million members of the uniformed services stationed away from home; their 700,000 eligible family members; and the 5.7 million U.S. citizens living, studying, and working overseas. ${ }^{1}$ The voting process for overseas civilians and military members stationed away from their voting residence is different from the regular absentee voting process. Voters covered under UOCAVA face unique voting obstacles due to their mobility and the time required to transmit and return ballots.

The Election Assistance Commission (EAC) partners with the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) to collect and evaluate data on the voting experiences of citizens covered under UOCAVA, and some of that data is presented in this report. Before 2014, the EAC asked states about UOCAVA voting as a part of the Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS), and FVAP asked local jurisdictions about UOCAVA voting as a part of its biennial Post-Election Survey of Local Election Officials. In 2014, FVAP and the EAC entered into a memorandum of understanding under which FVAP and the EAC combined their survey efforts. FVAP added certain questions to the EAVS, and the EAC agreed to provide FVAP with all data associated with UOCAVA voting after the EAVS had been administered. This collaboration reduced the data collection burden on local election officials while still allowing both the EAC and FVAP to fulfill their congressionally mandated requirements to study UOCAVA voters.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the UOCAVA voting process, which can be divided into six basic steps: (1) a voter registers to vote and requests a ballot; (2) the election office receives the request and accepts or rejects it; (3) a ballot is transmitted from the election office to the voter; (3) the ballot is marked by the voter and returned to the election office; (5) the election office receives the ballot; and (6) the ballot is accepted and counted, or it is rejected.

## Figure 1: The UOCAVA Voting Process Uniformed Service and Overseas Citizen Voting



The UOCAVA section of the EAVS captures information regarding UOCAVA registrations, ballots that are transmitted from and received by state and local election offices, and the outcomes for the transmitted and received ballots. This includes:

- registration and ballot requests by UOCAVA voters;
- ballots transmitted to voters by election offices;
- ballots returned by voters to election offices;
- ballots accepted and counted, and ballots rejected; and
- Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWAB) returned by UOCAVA voters.

Many of the questions in the UOCAVA section of the EAVS ask for totals at each step in the UOCAVA voting process to be divided into categories based on the type of voter-members of the uniformed services or overseas citizens. Other questions ask for data to be reported based on whether the ballot is a transmitted ballot-a ballot sent from the election office to the voter-or a FWAB. ${ }^{2}$ Additionally, the survey collects information on specific forms used by UOCAVA voters, including the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA), which is a registration and ballot request form for UOCAVA voters.

The uniformed services are the Armed Forces-Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy-the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the U.S. Merchant Marine. Uniformed service members, their spouses, and their dependents are referred to together as uniformed services voters. Overseas citizens are U.S. citizens living outside of the United States who are not uniformed service voters but are protected by UOCAVA.

## Changes to the UOCAVA Section for the 2016 Survey

In 2014, the UOCAVA section of the EAVS was expanded to include questions from FVAP's Post-Election Quantitative Survey of Local Election Officials. The goal of combining the surveys was to reduce the survey burden on election officials by asking them to answer a single set of questions about UOCAVA voting. Although the questions from the two surveys were phrased differently and asked for different levels of specificity, they captured many of the same data points. For example, both surveys asked questions pertaining to ballots transmitted, ballots returned, and ballots rejected. After combining the surveys, the new EAVS UOCAVA section contained questions that were redundant and, in places, the question language was not clear and concise. In order to streamline and improve the 2016 EAVS UOCAVA section, FVAP worked with the Council of State Governments' Overseas Voting Initiative to create a working group consisting of state and local election officials. This group identified the redundant questions in the UOCAVA section and the wording issues associated with several questions.

No changes were made to the survey instrument itself between 2014 and 2016, but additions and edits were made to the Supplemental Instruction Manual (SIM) to reflect the suggestions of the Section B Working Group. Nine questions were identified as being redundant, and four questions contained subitems that asked for data that most states do not record. ${ }^{3}$ The SIM instructed states to skip these 13 questions and their 62 subitems, and the items were grayed out in the data templates. Table 1 in Appendix B lists the questions that were to be skipped and explains what items in the survey replace the skipped items.

Improvements to the language that was used in the SIM were also made according to recommendations from the working group. The improvements addressed four issues:

Defining UOCAVA status more clearly: The 2014 survey referred to uniformed services voters and overseas citizens without providing a detailed explanation of the meaning of each term. This issue was addressed by including the FPCA's language for the definition of UOCAVA voters.

Clarifying what "transmit" means when discussing "transmitted ballots": The survey refers to transmitted ballots as a way of differentiating between ballots that are sent to UOCAVA voters by state or local election offices and FWABs that are not transmitted by election offices. The SIM was updated to differentiate between where the ballot originates. A transmitted ballot originates in an election office and is sent via postal mail, email, fax, or other mode, and a FWAB originates with the UOCAVA voter.

Clarifying the meaning of "returned and submitted for counting": The phrase "returned and submitted for counting" suggests that a ballot has to meet two criteria to be included in this category. First, the ballot has to be returned by the voter, and second, the ballot has to meet the criteria for being counted. Many states and localities excluded ballots that were received from voters but had obvious problems, such as not being signed by the voter, in this total. Because the EAC and FVAP want the total number of ballots returned, regardless of whether the ballot was subsequently counted or rejected, the SIM was updated to clarify that questions with this phrasing should include all ballots returned by voters, regardless of whether the ballot was counted or rejected.

Improving the usability of the SIM: Previously, the SIM did not provide definitions for all items in the survey. Additionally, the information was not presented in an easy-to-use format. In the revised SIM, definitions of election terms were added to each item, and the SIM was reformatted for greater clarity using plain language principles.

## UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted

Election offices in each jurisdiction are responsible for transmitting blank ballots, either through the mail or electronically, to all registered UOCAVA voters who request them. State election policies can affect the difference between the number of registered UOCAVA voters and the number of ballots transmitted to voters. For example, in some states where UOCAVA voters are permanently registered, UOCAVA voters can be designated as "inactive".

In 2016, the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three U.S. territories reported transmitting 930,156 ballots. The UOCAVA population is distributed unevenly across the states. Together, California, Florida, Washington, Texas, New York, and Colorado accounted for almost half of all UOCAVA ballots transmitted to voters.

## States and Transmitted UOCAVA Ballots

States with high numbers of UOCAVA ballots transmitted:
California transmitted 119,740 UOCAVA ballots to voters. Florida transmitted 116,674 UOCAVA ballots to voters. Washington transmitted 100,994 UOCAVA ballots to voters.

The 2016 EAVS found that nearly all states were able to provide data concerning the UOCAVA ballots transmitted by the type of voter. In 2016, 51.4 percent of UOCAVA ballots transmitted nationally were sent to U.S. civilians living overseas, 39.6 percent were sent to members of the uniformed services and their families, 9 percent of transmitted ballots were not differentiated by the type of voter. The proportion of ballots sent to overseas civilians or uniformed services members varied by state. In Virginia, for example, UOCAVA ballots were split about evenly between uniformed services and overseas civilian voters; in Massachusetts, 91.6 percent of UOCAVA ballots were transmitted to overseas civilians. In three-fifths of all states, a larger number of ballots were transmitted to uniformed services members.

A similar number of ballots were transmitted to UOCAVA voters in 2012 and 2016. However, as seen in Figure 2, the percentage of ballots transmitted to overseas citizens and uniformed services voters changed substantially between 2012 and 2016. The number of ballots sent to members of the uniformed services decreased by 18.6 percent nationally from 2012 to 2016. By contrast, there was a 23 percent increase in the number of ballots sent to overseas citizens from 2012 to 2016.

Figure 2. Number of Ballots Transmitted to UOCAVA Voters, 2012 and 2016


The change in the distribution of transmitted ballots across voter types was driven by several factors. First, 39 states reported transmitting fewer ballots to uniformed services members in 2016 than in 2012. California alone reported transmitting 35,960 fewer ballots to uniformed services members in 2016 than were reported in 2012. However, this is likely due, at least in part, to the large number of jurisdictions in California that did not categorize their transmitted ballots by voter type; 43 of California's 58 jurisdictions did not report transmitted ballots according to voter type in 2016 compared to only one jurisdiction that did not provide this information in 2012. In addition to the changes in the reported numbers of ballots transmitted to uniformed services members, 46 states reported transmitting a larger number of ballots to overseas civilians in 2016 than in 2012. Illinois, New Jersey, and Massachusetts accounted for almost 50 percent of the increase in ballots transmitted to overseas civilians.

Table 1. States with the Largest Change in UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted, by Voter Type

|  | Uniformed Services |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | \% Change |
| California | 52,312 | 16,352 | $-68.7 \%$ |
| Texas | 51,470 | 29,062 | $-43.5 \%$ |
| Virginia | 12,036 | 7,445 | $-38.1 \%$ |


|  | Overseas Citizens |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | \% Change |
| Illinois | 5,431 | 19,396 | $+257.1 \%$ |
| New Jersey | 3,076 | 16,349 | $+431.5 \%$ |
| Washington | 22,297 | 35,230 | $+58.0 \%$ |

## Transmitted Ballot Statuses

The EAVS tracks a variety of outcomes of ballots that are transmitted to UOCAVA voters. Of all the ballots transmitted in 2016, 70.5 percent were returned by voters. Another 19.4 percent of ballots were reported to have an unknown status, which may include ballots not received or returned. Other ballot dispositions included spoiled or replaced ballots ( 3.1 percent), ballots returned as undeliverable ( 0.8 percent), other dispositions ( 0.8 percent), and those unable to be categorized by their disposition ( 5.5 percent). Most states provided the number of ballots submitted for counting, but fewer states were able to provide counts of ballots returned as undeliverable and spoiled or replaced ballots.

## UOCAVA Ballots Returned

Once a ballot is marked by the voter, it must be returned to the election office in the voter's jurisdiction before their state's deadline for receiving UOCAVA ballots. This can be a challenge for some voters, depending on when they receive their ballot, how they are able to return their ballot, and the location from where they are casting their ballot. For example, voters living in another country who must return their ballots by mail may have more difficulty submitting a ballot before their state's deadline compared to a voter who can return their ballot by email, especially if they do not receive their ballots until shortly before Election Day. To resolve the issues presented by mailing times, a few states have adopted online ballot submission systems. However, due to security and privacy concerns associated with voted ballots, online ballot submission from voters is much less common than online transmission of ballots to voters. All UOCAVA voters have the option to use the FWAB in case their regular absentee ballot does not arrive in time to vote.

## The Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot (FWAB)

The FWAB is a special type of UOCAVA ballot that may be used by UOCAVA voters in the event that the voter's regular UOCAVA ballot does not arrive in time to vote. In order to use a FWAB, a voter must have registered and requested a ballot.

A total of 633,613 ballots were returned by UOCAVA voters during the 2016 general election. ${ }^{4}$ Consistent with previous election cycles, a large majority of the ballots submitted by UOCAVA voters during the 2016 general election were transmitted ballots rather than FWABs. States reported that 96.3 percent of the ballots submitted in 2016 were regular UOCAVA absentee ballots issued by the voters' jurisdiction. Figure 3 compares the number of ballots transmitted by each state to the number of ballots returned by voters. Although California transmitted the largest number of ballots to UOCAVA voters, Florida had the largest number of ballots returned.

Figure 3. UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted and Returned, $2016^{5}$


Of the 368,516 ballots transmitted by election offices to uniformed services members, 65.8 percent were returned. Overseas civilians returned transmitted ballots at a higher rate of 73.7 percent. Overall, 18 states reported more uniformed services ballots submitted than overseas civilian ballots, whereas 29 states had more overseas civilian ballots than uniformed services ballots submitted. The remaining seven states did not provide data categorizing the ballots by voter type.

## Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) Received ${ }^{6}$

Section 103 of UOCAVA provides a mechanism for uniformed services and overseas civilian voters to cast a FWAB (see 52 U.S.C.§ 20303). These ballots are available to uniformed aervices voters and voters living outside the United States who requested but did not receive the regular absentee ballots after having submitted a timely application for the ballot. The FWAB allows all UOCAVA voters to cast a ballot for Federal offices (President/Vice President as applicable, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner), and some states allow these ballots to be used for elections other than Federal elections. If a regular absentee ballot does not arrive in time for the individual to vote, the FWAB functions as a back-up ballot. The FWAB is available through voting assistance officers at military installations, at U.S. embassies or consulates, and on the FVAP website. An absentee uniformed services voter typically must:

- be absent from his or her voting residence;
- have applied for a regular ballot early enough so that the request is received by the appropriate local election officer not later than the state deadline or the date that is 30 days before the general election, unless the state grants additional permission; and
- not have received the requested regular absentee ballot from the state, unless the state grants additional permission.

A citizen outside the United States typically must:

- be located outside the United States (including those located at APO/FPO addresses);
- have applied for a regular ballot early enough so that the request is received by the appropriate local election officer not later than the state deadline or the date that is 30 days before the general election, unless the state grants additional permission; and
- not have received the requested regular absentee ballot from the state, unless the state grants additional permission (52 U.S.C. § 20301).

States reported that 23,391 FWABs were submitted in 2016, which accounted for 3.7 percent of all UOCAVA ballots submitted. This small proportion makes sense in the context of the FWAB's purpose, serving as a back-up ballot when the regular requested absentee ballot does not arrive in time to vote. However, three states-lowa and North Carolina-and the District of Columbia reported that more than 20 percent of the UOCAVA ballots they received were FWABs.

The number of FWABs received in the 2016 general election was much lower than in the 2012 general election, when 44,766 FWABs, representing 7.4 percent of the total number of UOCAVA ballots, were submitted (see Figure 4). This could be due, in part, to improvements in UOCAVA ballot transmission processes used by election offices. FWAB usage remains a relatively small proportion of UOCAVA voting among both uniformed services and overseas civilian voters. In 2016, FWABs accounted for 3.3 percent of the total ballots returned by uniformed services voters and 3.6 percent returned by overseas civilian voters.

Figure 4. Number of FWABs Received, 2008-2016


## Ballot Return Rates ${ }^{7}$

Return rates for UOCAVA ballots are calculated in a unique way, relating to the differences between regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs. As previously discussed, regular UOCAVA ballots originate with an election office and must be transmitted to the voter. FWABs, however, do not originate with an election office, so they cannot be tracked in this manner. Voters can get a FWAB, either from the internet or from voting assistance personnel, in the event that they do not receive their requested UOCAVA ballot. Under the assumption that voters who submitted a FWAB also requested that a regular UOCAVA ballot be transmitted to them, we include the counts of FWABs in both the transmitted and returned portions of the ballot return rate calculation.

The rate of return of UOCAVA ballots in 2016 was slightly lower than in the Presidential election in 2012. In 2016, 68.1 percent of UOCAVA ballots were returned compared to 69 percent in $2012 .{ }^{8}$ There are many reasons other than non-voting that can explain why a ballot that was transmitted to a voter might not be received by the election office. For example, a blank UOCAVA ballot that is sent in the mail by an election office might not get to a voter due to an error in the format of the address on file or difficulties with the postal system in the voter's country of residence. Likewise, when the voter returns his or her ballot, it can also fail to reach the election office because the voter might have failed to apply correct postage or might have used the wrong address for the election office.

> Ballot Return Rates: National and State-level National UOCAVA ballot return rate: 68.1\% States with high UOCAVA ballot return rates:

> Alaska has a UOCAVA ballot return rate of 93.2\%
> Idaho has a UOCAVA ballot return rate of 91.7\%
> Nevada has a UOCAVA ballot return rate of 91.2\%

## UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected

Once a UOCAVA ballot is received by an election office, election officials determine whether it should be accepted and counted, or rejected. The rejection rates of UOCAVA ballots are of particular interest because of the variation across states related to ballot return methods, deadlines for ballot return, and other factors.

Of the 633,592 regular ballots and FWABs that were received from voters in 2016, 512,696, or 80.9 percent, were counted by the states. ${ }^{9}$ In 2012, the reported number of regular ballots and FWABs that were counted was 478,889 . The proportions of ballots counted in 2016 differed for uniformed services members and overseas civilians: 88.6 percent of the ballots returned by uniformed services members were counted, whereas only 78.7 percent of ballots from overseas civilians were counted. The number of UOCAVA ballots counted in each state in 2016 range from 44 in Rhode Island to 78,361 in Florida. ${ }^{10}$ Figure 5 displays the number of ballots counted as a percentage of the ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters. Many states with smaller UOCAVA populations tended to count higher proportions of the ballots they sent out to voters. Several states, such as New York and Massachusetts, were unique in that they transmitted a large number of UOCAVA ballots and counted a large proportion of those ballots.

Figure 5. Percentage of Ballots Transmitted to UOCAVA Voters That Were Counted, 2016


Overall in 2016, the rejection rate for UOCAVA ballots and FWABs was relatively low at the national level. In total, 19,039 regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs were rejected, for a national rejection rate of 3 percent. Rejection rates ranged from zero percent in seven states to 13.7 percent in Idaho. ${ }^{11}$ Ballots were rejected at approximately equal rates for uniformed services members (3 percent) and overseas civilians ( 2.9 percent). Additionally, the rejection rate is slightly inflated due to a number of FWABs that were rejected because a regular absentee ballot was received from the same voter. These "rejections" still resulted in a vote being counted, so after correcting for those FWABs, the national rejection rate was 2.8 percent.

The reasons UOCAVA ballots were rejected are of particular interest. The most common reason for rejection was that the ballot was not received on time: 44.4 percent of the rejected ballots in 2016 were not counted for this reason. Another 16.2 percent were rejected because of problems with a required voter signature; for example, the signature may not have matched the signature on file or it may have been missing altogether. An additional 3.2 percent were rejected because the ballot lacked a postmark. Figure 6 displays the reasons that ballots were rejected in 2012 and 2016. More ballots were rejected due to missed deadlines and voter signature issues in 2012 than in 2016; in 2016, more ballots were rejected because they lacked a postmark.

Figure 6. Reasons for Rejecting UOCAVA Ballots, 2016


## Transmitted Ballots Counted

A total of 495,649 transmitted ballots were counted in the 2016 general election. About 43.6 percent of these ballots were submitted by uniformed service members, and 56.1 percent were submitted by overseas civilians. The remaining ballots were from other voter types or were not classified.

## FWABs Counted

Use of the FWAB resulted in at least 17,047 ballots being counted in the 2016 general election. ${ }^{12}$ FWABs made up 3.3 percent of UOCAVA ballots counted in the 2016 election. ${ }^{13}$ Of the number of FWABs counted, 33.3 percent were from uniformed services members and 58.8 percent were from overseas civilians. The largest numbers of FWABs were counted in California $(3,059)$, North Carolina $(1,628)$, and Pennsylvania $(1,485)$.

## Transmitted Ballots Rejected

In the 2016 election, the states reported rejecting 14,964 UOCAVA ballots that had originated with the elections office. Ballots received back from uniformed services members and overseas civilians were rejected at a roughly equal rate (about 2.5 percent). Several states rejected UOCAVA ballots at much higher rates than other states, as measured by the ratio of rejected to counted UOCAVA ballots. Missouri, Puerto Rico, and South Carolina counted all of their submitted ballots and rejected zero. Idaho, on the other hand, counted 2,352 transmitted ballots ( 88.3 percent) and rejected 311 (11.7 percent).

## FWABs Rejected

Of the 23,391 FWABs submitted in 2016, 4,075 (17.4 percent) were rejected. ${ }^{14}$ FWAB rejection rates ranged from zero percent in seven states to 59.8 percent in Idaho and 68.5 percent in Indiana. Unlike transmitted ballots, the rejection rate for FWABs was higher for uniformed services members than overseas civilians. FWABs received from uniformed service members were rejected at a rate of 20.0 percent, whereas FWABs from overseas civilians were rejected at a rate of 14.3 percent.

Figure 7. Reasons for Rejecting FWABs, 2016


The EAVS collects data on two reasons that FWABs can be rejected. Of all the FWABs that were rejected in the 2016 general election, 1,184 were rejected because they were received after the ballot receipt deadline. An additional 1,139 were rejected because the voters' regular absentee ballot was received. Figure 7 displays the reasons FWABs were rejected in 2016. Roughly equal proportions of ballots were rejected due to a missed deadline or because a regular UOCAVA ballot was received from the voter. However, for nearly half of the rejected FWABs (43 percent), the reason for rejection was not specified. This could indicate one of two things: either states do not track the reasons that FWABs were rejected or FWABs were rejected for some other reason not listed.

## Comparison: Transmitted Ballots versus FWABs

FWABs were used at similar rates by uniformed service members and overseas civilians in the 2016 general election. Of the 250,683 ballots received from uniformed services members, 3.1 percent were FWABs, and of the 365,854 ballots received from overseas civilians, 3.6 percent were FWABs.

| Table 2. Returned Ballots by Ballot and Voter Type, 2016 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Transmitted Ballots | FWABs |
| Uniformed Services <br> Members | 242,468 | 8,215 |
| Overseas Civilians | 352,657 | 13,197 |

Notably, and consistent with past survey data, FWABs were more likely to be rejected than regular state absentee ballots. FWABs made up 21.4 percent of the 19,039 rejected UOCAVA ballots, although FWABs were only 3.7 percent of the ballots returned by voters. States reported receiving 23,391 FWABs and rejecting 4,075 , or 17.4 percent. For transmitted ballots, the rejection rate was much smaller at 2.5 percent. Almost half of all rejected FWABs were in three states-Texas, Maryland, and California.

| Table 3. Returned Ballots by Type and Outcome, 2016 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Transmitted Ballots | FWABs |
| Counted | 495,649 | 17,047 |
| Rejected | 14,964 | 4,075 |

## Endnotes

${ }^{1}$ Overseas Citizen Population Analysis. (2016). Federal Voting Assistance Program. https://www.fvap.gov/
uploads/FVAP/Reports/FVAP-OCPA 201609 final.pdf
${ }^{2}$ The FWAB is a back-up ballot that can be used by UOCAVA voters to cast a vote, if their requested absentee ballot does not arrive in time.
${ }^{3}$ The subitems that were removed related to ballots transmitted to voters 45 days before the election and then ballots transmitted closer to the election.
${ }^{4}$ The report will only use counts of transmitted "regular" UOCAVA ballots and FWABs that were returned. Although the EAVS generally collects data on all types of UOCAVA ballots, even those that cannot be classified by type, the questions in the 2016 EAVS concerning the number of ballots returned only collected information on the two main ballot types of interest-regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs. These changes in data collection and reporting from previous years are due to the questions that were marked for skipping in the 2016 SIM, discussed on pages 119-120 and Appendix B of this report.
${ }^{5}$ In this figure, four states are not included because they did not report B26a-e, which asked about the number of ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters that were returned. Those states are Connecticut, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Oregon. Data on the number of ballots transmitted by those states can be found in UOCAVA Table 1.
${ }^{6}$ When discussing the rest of the voting process, special attention will be given to discussing transmitted ballots and FWABs separately. Transmitted ballots are sent from the elections office to the voter, but FWABs originate with the voter. A FWAB can be supplied by a voting assistance officer, found at consulates and the offices of overseas voting groups, or downloaded from the internet. Due to these differences in ballot origination, there are several different ways to calculate ballot return rates. Additionally, transmitted ballots and FWABs look different and have different requirements for being counted, so their rejection rates and reasons for rejection may also differ.
${ }^{7}$ Calculations of UOCAVA ballot return rates in this report intend to include two types of ballots: regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs. Due to changes in how states were asked to complete the survey in 2016, the survey did not collect information on the numbers of ballots returned that were an "other" ballot type or could not be categorized by ballot type.
${ }^{8}$ The return rate for a given state may be slightly higher or lower than average because of the way cases in which a voter returned multiple ballots were handled. For example, if a voter returned both a FWAB and a transmitted ballot, typically the transmitted ballot is counted. However, if a state counted both as returned, it could inflate the rate of returned ballots.
${ }^{9}$ When discussing these counts of ballots, we focus solely on transmitted ballots and FWABs because we do not have counts of "other" or "uncategorized" types of ballots that were returned. Due to the skipped questions in the 2016 survey, we do not have data on how many of these other ballots were returned. If we had included all returned UOCAVA ballots in our calculations of count rates and return rates, the rates would be artificially inflated.
${ }^{10}$ The numbers of ballots counted that were reported here only include regular UOCAVA ballots (B10a-c) and FWABs counted (B11a-c). States and territories that did not categorize their counted ballots (B9a-c) into these subitems are not included.
${ }^{11}$ The U. S. Virgin Islands were not able to report the number of ballots rejected, so they are not included in this analysis. Three states were not able to report a breakdown of the number of ballots rejected.
${ }^{12}$ The actual number of FWABs that were counted may be higher as some states were not able to provide a breakdown of their UOCAVA ballots by type of ballot.
${ }^{13}$ This is the percentage of FWABs that were counted out of the total number of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs that were counted.
${ }^{14}$ The numbers of FWABs that were counted and rejected do not add up to the number of FWABs that were returned. The disposition of the remaining 2,270 FWABs is unknown due to non-response from some jurisdictions and the use of different questions to make these calculations. There was no check within the data template to ensure that states reported a number of counted and rejected FWABs that was equal to the number returned. Additionally, some states differ in how they define rejected ballots. For example, in a few states, ballots that are returned after the submission deadline are neither counted nor rejected-they are simply considered returned ballots.

## UOCAVA Appendix A: Additional Information

## Laws Affecting UOCAVA Voters

The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) requires states and territories to provide a means for these citizens to register and to vote in elections for Federal office using absentee procedures. Under UOCAVA, citizens can use the Federal Post Card Application (FPCA) to register to vote and to request their absentee ballot. UOCAVA also provides for the use of a Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot (FWAB), which can be cast under certain conditions by voters who have applied for but who have not yet received their absentee ballot.

The Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act amended UOCAVA in October 2009. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that military personnel and overseas citizens have sufficient time to request and receive ballots and that states allow enough time for the submitted ballots to be counted toward the election results. Provisions of the act include requirements for states to transmit ballots at least 45 days before Federal elections and to offer electronic transmission of voting information and blank ballots. The MOVE Act also eliminated the Federal requirement that ballots be automatically transmitted for two subsequent general election cycles. This requirement changed to a minimum of the calendar year in which the FPCA was submitted.

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) was passed in 2002, and section 703(a) HAVA amended section 102 of UOCAVA by adding the requirement that each state must report certain election data to the EAC no more than 90 days after each Federal election. The data is to include the number of absentee ballots transmitted to absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters for the election and the number of those ballots that were returned. HAVA also provided that the EAC work with its board of advisors and its standards board to create a standardized format for collecting the data and that the data be made available to the public.

## Data Collection Requirements

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), 42 U.S.C. § 15301 et seq., mandates that, for each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the EAC shall collect comprehensive data from the states on all of the ballots sent and received by voters covered by UOCAVA, 42 U.S.C. § 1973ff. The UOCAVA statute also requires FVAP to collect data on UOCAVA voting.

Beginning in 2014, the EAC and FVAP consolidated their data collection efforts related to UOCAVA voters, using Section B of the EAVS as the sole method of collecting these data. The 2016 EAVS used a new and improved UOCAVA section that aimed to ease survey completion for the states while also improving the quality of the data being collected. Stakeholders and subject matter experts worked together to combine repetitive items and make the survey language more easy to interpret. These updates were provided in an instruction manual that was distributed along with the survey instrument. This report on UOCAVA voting will contain more information than past years on the use of special forms such as the FPCA and the FWAB.

# UOCAVA Appendix B: Section B Skipped Questions 

| Skipped Questions | Reason for Skipping |
| :---: | :---: |
| B3. Enter the total number of all UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots [FWAB]) returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting for the November 2016 general election. | This item can be skipped because the total number of ballots received from UOCAVA voters can be determined by adding together the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots counted (B8) and the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected (B13) |
| B4a through B4c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting (as entered in B3) into each category of UOCAVA voter (uniformed service members, overseas civilians, other). | These items can be skipped because the subtotals of ballots for each type of voter can be determined by adding up the total number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted (B9a-c) and the total number of UOCAVA ballots that were rejected (B15a-c). |
| B5a through B5c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting, divided into each category of UOCAVA voter (uniformed service members, overseas civilians, and other). | These items can be skipped because the subtotals of ballots for each type of voter can be determined by adding up the total number of regular UOCAVA absentee counted (B10a-c) and the total number of regular UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected (B16a-c). |
| B6a through B6c: FWABs returned and submitted for counting, divided into each category of UOCAVA voter (uniformed service members, overseas civilians, and other). | These items can be skipped because the sub-totals of FWABS for each type of voter can be determined by adding the number of FWABs counted (11a-c) to the number of FWABs rejected (17a-c). |
| B7a through B7c: Other type of ballots returned and submitted for counting, divided into each category of UOCAVA voter (uniformed service members, overseas civilians, and other). | These items can be skipped because the subtotals of FWABS for each type of voter can be determined by adding the number of other UOCAVA ballots counted ( $\mathbf{1 2 a - c}$ ) to the number of other UOCAVA ballots rejected (18a-c). |
| B23. Enter the date your jurisdiction first started transmitting absentee ballots to UOCAVA voters for the November 2016 election. | This item can be skipped because states typically do not track the date of transmission for UOCAVA ballots. |
| B24. How many UOCAVA absentee ballots did your jurisdiction transmit to UOCAVA voters using the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45 -day deadline? | The timing component of this question can be skipped because states do not track the date of transmission. The remaining components of the question still capture the total number of UOCAVA ballots transmitted by mail, email, and other modes. |
| B27. How many UOCAVA absentee ballots were received using the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline? | The timing component of this question was dropped because states do not track the date of transmission. The remaining components of the question still capture the total number of UOCAVA ballots received by mail, email, and other modes. |

## Skipped Questions

B28: Of the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots received (as reported in B26a), how many were rejected for the following groups (uniformed service members, overseas civilians, and other)?

## B29. Of the total number of UOCAVA absentee

 ballots that were rejected (as reported in B28e), how many were rejected because they were received after the statutory deadline by the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline?B30. Enter the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted in your jurisdiction by the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45day deadline.

B32. Of the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters (as reported in B31e), how many were rejected for the following groups?

## Reason for Skipping

This item can be skipped because it can be determined by subtracting the total number of ballots counted for each type of voter (10a-c) from the total number of ballots received from each type of voter (26b-e).

The timing component of this question can be skipped because states do not track the date of transmission. The remaining components of this question still capture the total number of UOCAVA ballots rejected by mail, email, and other modes.

The timing component of this question can be skipped because states do not track the date of transmission. The remaining components of the question still capture the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted by mail, email, and other modes.

This item can be skipped because it can be determined by subtracting the total number of ballots counted for each type of voter (11a-c) from the total number of ballots received from each type of voter (31a-d).

This question is duplicative of B11. Simple use the subtotals reported in B11.

B35. Enter the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters that were counted for the following groups.

## UOCAVA Appendix C: UOCAVA Tables

| UOCAVA Table 1: U0CAVA Ballots Transmitted by Voter Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ballots Transmitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | All UOCAVA Voters | Uniformed Services Members |  | Overseas Civilians |  | Not Categorized by Voter Type |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| Alabama | 4,888 | 2,549 | 52.15 | 1,433 | 29.32 | 906 | 18.54 |
| Alaska | 9,674 | 7,587 | 78.43 | 2,087 | 21.57 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Arizona | 14,761 | 5,502 | 37.27 | 8,995 | 60.94 | 264 | 1.79 |
| Arkansas | 2,455 | 1,381 | 56.25 | 1,062 | 43.26 | 12 | 0.49 |
| California | 119,740 | 16,352 | 13.66 | 44,827 | 37.44 | 58,561 | 48.91 |
| Colorado | 38,625 | 11,913 | 30.84 | 26,712 | 69.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Connecticut | 6,426 | 2,496 | 38.84 | 3,930 | 61.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Delaware | 2,000 | 726 | 36.3 | 1,274 | 63.7 | 0 | 0.00 |
| District of Columbia | 4,158 | 170 | 4.09 | 3,988 | 95.91 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Florida | 116,674 | 73,009 | 62.58 | 43,304 | 37.12 | 361 | 0.31 |
| Georgia | 18,634 | 8,218 | 44.1 | 10,416 | 55.9 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Guam | 131 | 66 | 50.38 | 65 | 49.62 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Hawaii | 3,436 | 87 | 2.53 | 682 | 19.85 | 2,667 | 77.62 |
| Idaho | 3,030 | 1,703 | 56.2 | 1,327 | 43.8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Illinois | 28,139 | 8,760 | 31.13 | 19,398 | 68.94 | -19 | -0.07 |
| Indiana | 9,928 | 3,634 | 36.6 | 6,123 | 61.67 | 171 | 1.72 |
| Iowa | 4,806 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,806 | 100.00 |
| Kansas | 4,432 | 1,624 | 36.64 | 2,808 | 63.36 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Kentucky | 7,690 | 4,162 | 54.12 | 3,528 | 45.88 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Louisiana | 7,249 | 3,940 | 54.35 | 3,309 | 45.65 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maine | 4,821 | 1,194 | 24.77 | 3,627 | 75.23 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Maryland | 22,489 | 7,031 | 31.26 | 15,458 | 68.74 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Massachusetts | 23,479 | 1,969 | 8.39 | 21,510 | 91.61 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Michigan | 21,574 | 7,537 | 34.94 | 14,037 | 65.06 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Minnesota | 15,907 | 4,318 | 27.15 | 11,589 | 72.85 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mississippi | 3,431 | 2,211 | 64.44 | 1,220 | 35.56 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Missouri | 11,327 | 5,892 | 52.02 | 5,435 | 47.98 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Montana | 4,979 | 3,053 | 61.32 | 1,926 | 38.68 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nebraska | 2,486 | 1,065 | 42.84 | 1,421 | 57.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nevada | 6,990 | 3,047 | 43.59 | 3,943 | 56.41 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Hampshire | 5,904 | 1,986 | 33.64 | 3,918 | 66.36 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Jersey | 18,856 | 2,507 | 13.3 | 16,349 | 86.7 | 0 | 0.00 |
| New Mexico | 4,201 | 2,128 | 50.65 | 2,001 | 47.63 | 72 | 1.71 |
| New York | 46,582 | 8,467 | 18.18 | 38,115 | 81.82 | 0 | 0.00 |


| UOCAVA Table 1: UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted by Voter Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ballots Transmitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | All UOCAVA Voters | Uniformed Services Members |  | Overseas Civilians |  | Not Categorized by Voter Type |  |
|  |  | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. | Total | Pct. |
| North Carolina | 21,447 | 8,563 | 39.93 | 12,884 | 60.07 | 0 | 0.00 |
| North Dakota | 1,734 | 1,019 | 58.77 | 715 | 41.23 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Ohio | 21,830 | 8,566 | 39.24 | 13,264 | 60.76 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oklahoma | 6,848 | 4,359 | 63.65 | 2,489 | 36.35 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oregon | 16,473 | 6,047 | 36.71 | 6,459 | 39.21 | 3,967 | 24.08 |
| Pennsylvania | 30,184 | 10,833 | 35.89 | 19,351 | 64.11 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Puerto Rico | 886 | 642 | 72.46 | 244 | 27.54 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Rhode Island | 2,379 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,379 | 100.00 |
| South Carolina | 8,618 | 4,614 | 53.54 | 4,004 | 46.46 | 0 | 0.00 |
| South Dakota | 2,581 | 1,716 | 66.49 | 821 | 31.81 | 44 | 1.70 |
| Tennessee | 13,950 | 9,374 | 67.2 | 4,572 | 32.77 | 4 | 0.03 |
| Texas | 65,193 | 29,062 | 44.58 | 32,685 | 50.14 | 3,446 | 5.29 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 13 | 13 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Utah | 6,959 | 3,065 | 44.04 | 3,894 | 55.96 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Vermont | 2,763 | 406 | 14.69 | 2,357 | 85.31 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Virginia | 14,710 | 7,445 | 50.61 | 7,265 | 49.39 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Washington | 100,994 | 60,473 | 59.88 | 35,230 | 34.88 | 5,291 | 5.24 |
| West Virginia | 2,271 | 792 | 34.87 | 1,363 | 60.02 | 116 | 5.11 |
| Wisconsin | 9,259 | 4,686 | 50.61 | 4,573 | 49.39 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Wyoming | 1,162 | 557 | 47.93 | 480 | 41.31 | 125 | 10.76 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 930,156 | 368,516 | 39.62 | 478,467 | 51.44 | 83,173 | 8.94 |

UOCAVA Table 1 Calculation Notes
(1) Ballots Transmitted, All UOCAVA Voters uses question B1a.
(2) Ballots Transmitted to Uniformed Services Members, Total uses question B1b.
(3) Ballots Transmitted to Uniformed Services Members, Pct is the percentage of all transmitted UOCAVA ballots that were sent to uniformed services members. It uses B1b divided by B1a
(4) Ballots Transmitted to Overseas Civilians, Total uses question B1c.
(5) Ballots Transmitted to Overseas Civilians, Pct is the percentage of all transmitted UOCAVA ballots that were sent to overseas civilians. It uses question B1c divided by B1a.
(6) Ballots Transmitted, Not Categorized by Voter Type, Total uses question B1a minus the sum of B1b and B1c.
(7) Ballots Transmitted, Not Categorized by Voter Type, Pct is the percentage of all transmitted UOCAVA ballots that could not be categorized by the type of voter they were sent to. It uses question B1a minus the sum of B1b and B1c, all divided by B1a.

## UOCAVA Table 1 Data Notes

Alabama: Some jurisdictions reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B1b.

California: The state reported a much lower number of ballots transmitted to Uniformed Services members in 2016 than in 2012 due to many of its jurisdictions not categorizing transmitted ballots by voter type in 2016.

Florida: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B1b.

Hawaii: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military dependents in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B1b. Additionally, the jurisdiction with the largest number of transmitted ballots in Hawaii did not categorize those ballots by voter type, so the reported number of ballots transmitted to Uniformed Services Members in 2016 is much lower than in 2012.
lowa: The state did not categorize its transmitted ballots by voter type.
Rhode Island: The state did not categorize its transmitted ballots by voter type.
Texas: Some jurisdictions reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B1b.
Virginia: Ballots transmitted to Military spouses and their dependents were reported in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B1b.

| UOCAVA Table 2: UOCAVA Ballots Received by Ballot Type, Uniformed Services Members |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Return Rate | Regular UOCAVA Ballots |  | FWAB |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Pct. <br> Received | Total | Pct. Received |
| Alabama | 1,643 | 64.46 | 1,569 | 49.71 | 74 | 2.34 |
| Alaska | 7,056 | 93 | 6,627 | 73.53 | 429 | 4.76 |
| Arizona | 4,361 | 79.26 | 4,181 | 34.47 | 180 | 1.48 |
| Arkansas | 1,307 | 94.64 | 1,148 | 51.69 | 159 | 7.16 |
| California | 14,788 | 90.44 | 14,153 | 18.79 | 635 | 0.84 |
| Colorado | 6,730 | 56.49 | 6,704 | 28.91 | 26 | 0.11 |
| Connecticut | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Delaware | 595 | 81.96 | 534 | 30.69 | 61 | 3.51 |
| District of Columbia | 238 | 140 | 111 | 2.54 | 127 | 2.91 |
| Florida | 52,300 | 71.63 | 51,979 | 63.87 | 321 | 0.39 |
| Georgia | 5,666 | 68.95 | 5,666 | 41.82 | 0 | 0 |
| Guam | 33 | 50 | 32 | 42.11 | 1 | 1.32 |
| Hawaii | 37 | 42.53 | 37 | 1.41 | 0 | 0 |
| Idaho | 1,564 | 91.84 | 1,509 | 54.28 | 55 | 1.98 |
| Illinois | 6,183 | 70.58 | 6,183 | 27.25 | 0 | 0 |
| Indiana | 4,098 | 112.77 | 4,036 | 39.14 | 62 | 0.6 |
| lowa | 504 |  | 87 | 2.63 | 417 | 12.61 |
| Kansas | 1,395 | 85.9 | 1,250 | 31.26 | 145 | 3.63 |
| Kentucky | 1,997 | 47.98 | 1,943 | 47.69 | 54 | 1.33 |
| Louisiana | 2,270 | 57.61 | 2,245 | 49.88 | 25 | 0.56 |
| Maine | 931 | 77.97 | 899 | 21.28 | 32 | 0.76 |
| Maryland | 4,249 | 60.43 | 3,913 | 23.23 | 336 | 1.99 |
| Massachusetts | 1,363 | 69.22 | 1,272 | 6.53 | 91 | 0.47 |
| Michigan | 5,697 | 75.59 | 5,571 | 32.41 | 126 | 0.73 |
| Minnesota | 3,025 | 70.06 | 2,912 | 23.06 | 113 | 0.89 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Missouri | 4,323 | 73.37 | 4,079 | 46.35 | 244 | 2.77 |
| Montana | 2,511 | 82.25 | 2,494 | 58.53 | 17 | 0.4 |
| Nebraska | 818 | 76.81 | 766 | 37.81 | 52 | 2.57 |
| Nevada | 2,702 | 88.68 | 2,570 | 40.33 | 132 | 2.07 |
| New Hampshire | 1,697 | 85.45 | 1,683 | 32.55 | 14 | 0.27 |
| New Jersey | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| New Mexico | 1,963 | 92.25 | 1,851 | 43.44 | 112 | 2.63 |
| New York | 6,411 | 75.72 | 6,307 | 14.92 | 104 | 0.25 |
| North Carolina | 10,934 | 127.69 | 10,147 | 139.44 | 787 | 10.81 |
| North Dakota | 850 | 83.42 | 850 | 56.67 | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 7,058 | 82.4 | 6,819 | 37.46 | 239 | 1.31 |


|  |  |  | Regular UOC | VA Ballots |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Return Rate | Total | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. <br> Received |
| Oklahoma | 2,622 | 60.15 | 2,120 | 48.66 | 502 | 11.52 |
| Oregon | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| Pennsylvania | 7,788 | 71.89 | 7,207 | 32.28 | 581 | 2.6 |
| Puerto Rico | 324 | 50.47 | 324 | 53.11 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 4,614 | 100 | 4,614 | 53.54 | 0 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 1,360 | 79.25 | 1,329 | 60.74 | 31 | 1.42 |
| Tennessee | 7,467 | 79.66 | 7,200 | 64.05 | 267 | 2.38 |
| Texas | 17,594 | 60.54 | 16,600 | 37.08 | 994 | 2.22 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont | 235 | 57.88 | 235 | 11.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 4,568 | 61.36 | 4,318 | 34.36 | 250 | 1.99 |
| Washington | 32,488 | 53.72 | 32,156 | 54.53 | 332 | 0.56 |
| West Virginia | 979 | 123.61 | 924 | 55.76 | 55 | 3.32 |
| Wisconsin | 2,911 | 62.12 | 2,878 | 43.39 | 33 | 0.5 |
| Wyoming | 436 | 78.28 | 436 | 47.08 | 0 | 0 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 250,683 | 68.03 | 242,468 | 38.27 | 8,215 | 1.3 |

UOCAVA Table 2 Calculation Notes
(1) Total UOCAVA Ballots Received, Uniformed Services Members uses questions B26b and B31a.
(2) Ballot Return Rate, Uniformed Services Members is the rate at which regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs were returned by uniformed service voters. It uses the sum of questions B26b and B31a divided by B1b.
(3) Regular UOCAVA Ballots Received, Uniformed Services Members, Total uses question B26b.
(4) Regular UOCAVA Ballots Received, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Received is the percentage of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received that were regular UOCAVA ballots submitted by uniformed services voters. It uses question B26b divided by the sum of questions B26a, B31a, B31b, B31c and B31d.
(5) FWABs Received, Uniformed Services Members, Total uses question B31a.
(6) FWABs Received, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Received is the percentage of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received that were FWABs submitted by uniformed services voters. It uses question B31a divided by the sum of questions B26a, B31a, B31b, B31c and B31d.

## UOCAVA Table 2 Data Notes

General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than $100 \%$ due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.

Alabama: Some jurisdictions reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b.
lowa: The state did not categorize its transmitted ballots by voter type.
Rhode Island: The state did not categorize its transmitted or received ballots by voter type.
Texas: One jurisdiction reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b.
Utah: The state did not categorize the regular UOCAVA ballots it received by voter type. It also did not report data on the number of FWABs returned.

| UOCAVA Table 3: U0CAVA Ballots Received by Ballot Type, Overseas Citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Return Rate | Regular UOCAVA Ballots |  | FWAB |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. Received |
| Alabama | 1,114 | 77.74 | 1,085 | 34.38 | 29 | 0.92 |
| Alaska | 1,957 | 93.77 | 1,862 | 20.66 | 95 | 1.05 |
| Arizona | 7,526 | 83.67 | 7,413 | 61.11 | 113 | 0.93 |
| Arkansas | 897 | 84.46 | 892 | 40.16 | 5 | 0.23 |
| California | 54,506 | 121.59 | 51,589 | 68.48 | 2,917 | 3.87 |
| Colorado | 16,459 | 61.62 | 16,386 | 70.66 | 73 | 0.31 |
| Connecticut | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| Delaware | 1,144 | 89.8 | 1,074 | 61.72 | 70 | 4.02 |
| District of Columbia | 4,128 | 103.51 | 3,258 | 74.62 | 870 | 19.93 |
| Florida | 29,038 | 67.06 | 28,670 | 35.23 | 368 | 0.45 |
| Georgia | 7,882 | 75.67 | 7,882 | 58.18 | 0 | 0 |
| Guam | 43 | 66.15 | 42 | 55.26 | 1 | 1.32 |
| Hawaii | 538 | 78.89 | 522 | 19.95 | 16 | 0.61 |
| Idaho | 1,216 | 91.64 | 1,154 | 41.51 | 62 | 2.23 |
| Illinois | 15,706 | 80.97 | 15,706 | 69.23 | 0 | 0 |
| Indiana | 6,215 | 101.5 | 6,134 | 59.48 | 81 | 0.79 |
| lowa | 626 | . | 128 | 3.87 | 498 | 15.06 |
| Kansas | 2,604 | 92.73 | 2,478 | 61.97 | 126 | 3.15 |
| Kentucky | 2,074 | 58.79 | 2,055 | 50.44 | 19 | 0.47 |
| Louisiana | 2,231 | 67.42 | 2,205 | 48.99 | 26 | 0.58 |
| Maine | 3,293 | 90.79 | 3,191 | 75.54 | 102 | 2.41 |
| Maryland | 12,515 | 80.96 | 11,550 | 68.58 | 965 | 5.73 |
| Massachusetts | 18,103 | 84.16 | 17,430 | 89.54 | 673 | 3.46 |
| Michigan | 11,490 | 81.86 | 11,306 | 65.78 | 184 | 1.07 |
| Minnesota | 9,603 | 82.86 | 9,359 | 74.11 | 244 | 1.93 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| Missouri | 4,478 | 82.39 | 4,283 | 48.66 | 195 | 2.22 |
| Montana | 1,750 | 90.86 | 1,737 | 40.77 | 13 | 0.31 |
| Nebraska | 1,208 | 85.01 | 1,141 | 56.32 | 67 | 3.31 |
| Nevada | 3,670 | 93.08 | 3,511 | 55.1 | 159 | 2.5 |
| New Hampshire | 3,473 | 88.64 | 3,424 | 66.23 | 49 | 0.95 |
| New Jersey | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . |
| New Mexico | 1,311 | 65.52 | 1,247 | 29.27 | 64 | 1.5 |
| New York | 35,872 | 94.12 | 35,212 | 83.28 | 660 | 1.56 |
| North Carolina | 16,637 | 129.13 | 15,777 | 216.81 | 860 | 11.82 |


| UOCAVA Table 3: UOCAVA Ballots Received by Ballot Type, Overseas Citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Return Rate | Regular UOCAVA Ballots |  | FWAB |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Pct. <br> Received | Total | Pct. <br> Received |
| North Dakota | 650 | 90.91 | 650 | 43.33 | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 11,147 | 84.04 | 10,856 | 59.63 | 291 | 1.6 |
| Oklahoma | 1,735 | 69.71 | 1,529 | 35.09 | 206 | 4.73 |
| Oregon | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Pennsylvania | 14,540 | 75.14 | 13,635 | 61.07 | 905 | 4.05 |
| Puerto Rico | 286 | 117.21 | 286 | 46.89 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 4,004 | 100 | 4,004 | 46.46 | 0 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 675 | 82.22 | 661 | 30.21 | 14 | 0.64 |
| Tennessee | 3,771 | 82.48 | 3,650 | 32.47 | 121 | 1.08 |
| Texas | 15,142 | 46.33 | 14,171 | 31.66 | 971 | 2.17 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont | 1,775 | 75.31 | 1,775 | 86.08 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 6,119 | 84.23 | 5,765 | 45.88 | 354 | 2.82 |
| Washington | 21,911 | 62.19 | 21,221 | 35.99 | 690 | 1.17 |
| West Virginia | 672 | 49.3 | 656 | 39.59 | 16 | 0.97 |
| Wisconsin | 3,722 | 81.39 | 3,697 | 55.74 | 25 | 0.38 |
| Wyoming | 398 | 82.92 | 398 | 42.98 | 0 | 0 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 365,854 | 76.46 | 352,657 | 55.66 | 13,197 | 2.08 |

UOCAVA Table 3 Calculation Notes
(1) Total UOCAVA Ballots Received, Overseas Civilians uses questions B26c and B31a.
(2) Ballot Return Rate, Overseas Civilians is the rate at which regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs were returned by overseas civilians. It uses the sum of questions B26c and B31b divided by B1c.
(3) Regular UOCAVA Ballots Received, Overseas Civilians, Total uses question B26c.
(4) Regular UOCAVA Ballots Received, Overseas Civilians, Pct. Received is the percentage of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received that were regular UOCAVA ballots submitted by overseas civilians. It uses question B26c divided by the sum of questions B26a, B31a, B31b, B31c and B31d.
(5) FWABs Received, Overseas Civilians, Total uses question B31b.
(6) FWABs Received, Overseas Civilians, Pct. Received is the percentage of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received that were FWABs submitted by overseas civilians. It uses question B31b divided by the sum of questions B26a, B31a, B31b, B31c and B31d.

## UOCAVA Table 3 Data Notes

General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than $100 \%$ due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.
lowa: The state did not categorize the number of transmitted ballots by voter type.
Rhode Island: The state did not categorize the number of transmitted or received ballots by voter type.
Virginia: FWABs received from Military spouses and their dependents were reported in B31c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B31a.

| UOCAVA Table 4: UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Voter Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Voters |  |  | Uniformed Services Members |  |  | Overseas Citizens |  |  |
|  | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Pct. Received |
| Alabama | 2,991 | 61.19 | 94.77 | 1,478 | 57.98 | 89.96 | 959 | 66.92 | 86.09 |
| Alaska | 8,298 | 85.78 | 92.07 | 6,498 | 85.65 | 92.09 | 1,800 | 86.25 | 91.98 |
| Arizona | 12,045 | 81.6 | 99.3 | 4,472 | 81.28 | 102.55 | 7,520 | 83.6 | 99.92 |
| Arkansas | 1,947 | 79.31 | 87.66 | 997 | 72.19 | 76.28 | 681 | 64.12 | 75.92 |
| California | 79,677 | 66.54 | 105.77 | 17,984 | 109.98 | 121.61 | 59,792 | 133.38 | 109.70 |
| Colorado | 22,816 | 59.07 | 98.39 | 6,575 | 55.19 | 97.7 | 16,241 | 60.8 | 98.68 |
| Connecticut | 5,253 | 81.75 |  | 1,562 | 62.58 |  | 3,691 | 93.92 |  |
| Delaware | 1,610 | 80.5 | 92.53 | 542 | 74.66 | 91.09 | 1,068 | 83.83 | 93.36 |
| District of Columbia | 4,189 | 100.75 | 95.95 | 127 | 74.71 | 53.36 | 4,062 | 101.86 | 98.40 |
| Florida | 81,379 | 69.75 | 100 | 50,036 | 68.53 | 95.67 | 28,342 | 65.45 | 97.60 |
| Georgia | 12,432 | 66.72 | 91.76 | 5,203 | 63.31 | 91.83 | 7,229 | 69.4 | 91.72 |
| Guam | 72 | 54.96 | 94.74 | 32 | 48.48 | 96.97 | 40 | 61.54 | 93.02 |
| Hawaii | 2,592 | 75.44 | 99.04 | 42 | 48.28 | 113.51 | 504 | 73.9 | 93.68 |
| Idaho | 2,398 | 79.14 | 86.26 | 1,377 | 80.86 | 88.04 | 1,021 | 76.94 | 83.96 |
| Illinois | 21,028 | 74.73 | 92.69 | 6,028 | 68.81 | 97.49 | 15,322 | 78.99 | 97.56 |
| Indiana | 6,880 | 69.3 | 66.71 | 3,285 | 90.4 | 80.16 | 3,595 | 58.71 | 57.84 |
| lowa | 3,707 | 77.13 | 112.13 | 39 |  | 7.74 | 40 |  | 6.39 |
| Kansas | 3,687 | 83.19 | 92.2 | 1,239 | 76.29 | 88.82 | 2,449 | 87.22 | 94.05 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Louisiana | 4,228 | 58.33 | 93.93 | 2,142 | 54.37 | 94.36 | 2,086 | 63.04 | 93.50 |
| Maine | 4,049 | 83.99 | 95.86 | 897 | 75.13 | 96.35 | 3,152 | 86.9 | 95.72 |
| Maryland | 15,558 | 69.18 | 92.38 | 4,002 | 56.92 | 94.19 | 11,551 | 74.73 | 92.30 |
| Massachusetts | 19,281 | 82.12 | 99.05 | 1,335 | 67.8 | 97.95 | 17,946 | 83.43 | 99.13 |
| Michigan | 16,755 | 77.66 | 97.49 | 5,592 | 74.19 | 98.16 | 11,163 | 79.53 | 97.15 |


| UOCAVA Table 4: UOCAVA Ballots Counted by Voter Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Voters |  |  | Uniformed Services Members |  |  | Overseas Citizens |  |  |
|  | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Pct. Received | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Pct. Received |
| Minnesota | 11,601 | 72.93 | 91.87 | 2,890 | 66.93 | 95.54 | 8,711 | 75.17 | 90.71 |
| Mississippi | 2,089 | 60.89 | . | 1,262 | 57.08 |  | 827 | 67.79 |  |
| Missouri | 8,429 | 74.42 | 95.77 | 4,107 | 69.7 | 95 | 4,316 | 79.41 | 96.38 |
| Montana | 4,227 | 84.9 | 99.2 | 2,490 | 81.56 | 99.16 | 1,737 | 90.19 | 99.26 |
| Nebraska | 1,931 | 77.67 | 95.31 | 796 | 74.74 | 97.31 | 1,135 | 79.87 | 93.96 |
| Nevada | 6,290 | 89.99 | 98.71 | 2,677 | 87.86 | 99.07 | 3,613 | 91.63 | 98.45 |
| New Hampshire | 4,928 | 83.47 | 95.32 | 1,637 | 82.43 | 96.46 | 3,291 | 84 | 94.76 |
| New Jersey | 15,103 | 80.1 |  | 1,784 | 71.16 |  | 13,319 | 81.47 |  |
| New Mexico | 3,401 | 80.96 | 79.82 | 1,993 | 93.66 | 101.53 | 1,414 | 70.66 | 107.86 |
| New York | 41,130 | 88.3 | 97.27 | 6,236 | 73.65 | 97.27 | 34,894 | 91.55 | 97.27 |
| North Carolina | 17,201 | 80.2 | 236.37 | 6,317 | 73.77 | 57.77 | 10,884 | 84.48 | 65.42 |
| North Dakota | 1,451 | 83.68 | 96.73 | 819 | 80.37 | 96.35 | 632 | 88.39 | 97.23 |
| Ohio | 17,877 | 81.89 | 98.2 | 6,573 | 76.73 | 93.13 | 11,304 | 85.22 | 101.41 |
| Oklahoma | 4,253 | 62.11 | 97.61 | 2,560 | 58.73 | 97.64 | 1,693 | 68.02 | 97.58 |
| Oregon | 12,396 | 75.25 |  | 4,149 | 68.61 |  | 5,063 | 78.39 |  |
| Pennsylvania | 22,327 | 73.97 | 100 | 7,788 | 71.89 | 100 | 14,539 | 75.13 | 99.99 |
| Puerto Rico | 610 | 68.85 | 100 | 324 | 50.47 | 100 | 286 | 117.21 | 100.00 |
| Rhode Island | 1,915 | 80.5 | 99.79 | 0 | . |  | 0 |  |  |
| South Carolina | 6,820 | 79.14 | 79.14 | 3,391 | 73.49 | 73.49 | 3,429 | 85.64 | 85.64 |
| South Dakota | 2,984 | 115.61 | 136.38 | 1,582 | 92.19 | 116.32 | 1,032 | 125.7 | 152.89 |
| Tennessee | 10,881 | 78 | 96.79 | 7,266 | 77.51 | 97.31 | 3,614 | 79.05 | 95.84 |
| Texas | 41,801 | 64.12 | 93.38 | 19,364 | 66.63 | 110.06 | 21,095 | 64.54 | 139.31 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 6 | 46.15 | 100 | 6 | 46.15 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Utah | 4,036 | 58 | 104.99 | 1,476 | 48.16 |  | 2,466 | 63.33 |  |

UOCAVA Table 4 Calculation Notes
(1) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, All Voters, Total Counted uses question B8a. transmitted to UOCAVA voters. It uses question B8a divided by B1a
(2) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, All Voters, Pct. Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted as a percentage of the number that were
3) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, All Voters, Pct. Received is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted as a percentage of the number that were received from UOCAVA voters. It uses question B8a divided by the sum of question B26a, B31a, B31b, B31c and B31d.
(4) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Total Counted uses question B9a.
(5) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted for uniformed services voters as a percentage of the number that were transmitted to uniformed services voters. It uses question B9a divided by B1b.
(6) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Received is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted for uniformed services voters as a percentage of the number that were received from uniformed services voters. It uses question B9a divided by the sum of question B26b and B31a. (7) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Total Counted uses question B9b.
(8) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, As \% of Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted for uniformed services voters as a percentage of the number that were transmitted to overseas civilians. It uses question B9b divided by B1c.
(9) Total UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, As \% of Received is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted for uniformed services voters as a percentage of the number that were received from uniformed services voters. It uses question B9b divided by the sum of question B26c and B31b.
General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than 100\% due to difference in how states reported transmitted, received and counted ballots.
Alabama: Some jurisdictions reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members
category, B1b. Some jurisdictions reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b.
Arkansas: One jurisdiction did not report the total number of ballots counted, B8a. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B9a, B9b and B9c).
California: One jurisdiction in California reported ballots counted from permanent overseas citizens in B9c. For this report, they were added to the overseas
civilians category, B9b. Additionally, one jurisdiction did not report the number ballots counted for overseas civilians. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).
Connecticut: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Florida: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B1b. One jurisdiction did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a).
Hawaii: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military dependents in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category B1b.
lowa: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted for overseas civilians in B9b. For this report, the number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).
Kansas: One jurisdiction did not report the total number of ballots counted, B8a. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B9a, B9b and B9c). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. For this report, the number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a).
Kentucky: The state did not report B8a, the total number of ballots counted, that was used in this column. However, in the B9-12 battery, they reported counts in $\mathrm{B9C}, \mathrm{~B} 10 \mathrm{a}$, and B10b, for a total of 6,754 ballots counted. Mississippi: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots. New Jersey: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Oregon: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Rhode Island: The state did not categorize its transmitted, received or counted ballots by voter type.
Texas: Some jurisdictions reported ballots counted from Military spouses in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. Some jurisdictions did not report either B9a or B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of their parts (B10a, B11a and B12a, or, B10b, B11b and B12b). Additionally, one jurisdiction reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b.
Virginia: Ballots counted from Military spouses were reported in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. FWABs received from Military spouses and their dependents were reported in B31c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B31a.

| UOCAVA Table 5: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Uniformed Services Members |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Alabama | 1,478 | 82 | 4.99 | 1,237 | 46 | 2.93 | 41 | 12 | 16.22 | 200 | 24 |
| Alaska | 6,498 | 558 | 7.91 | 6,297 | 330 | 4.98 | 201 | 228 | 53.15 | 0 | 0 |
| Arizona | 4,472 | 45 | 1.03 | 4,108 | 23 | 0.55 | 157 | 17 | 9.44 | 207 | 5 |
| Arkansas | 997 | 128 | 9.79 | 804 | 70 | 6.1 | 11 | 7 | 4.4 | 182 | 51 |
| California | 17,984 | 1,014 | 6.86 | 17,054 | 701 | 4.95 | 331 | 249 | 39.21 | 599 | 64 |
| Colorado | 6,575 | 157 | 2.33 | 6,549 | 157 | 2.34 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 1,562 | 20 | . | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | 0 | . | 1,562 | 20 |
| Delaware | 542 | 15 | 2.52 | 492 | 4 | 0.75 | 50 | 11 | 18.03 | 0 | 0 |
| District of Columbia | 127 | 1 | 0.42 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0.79 | 0 | 0 |
| Florida | 50,036 | 1,826 | 3.49 | 49,833 | 1,747 | 3.36 | 193 | 74 | 23.05 | 10 | 5 |
| Georgia | 5,203 | 455 | 8.03 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 5,203 | 455 |
| Guam | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 42 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 12 | 0 |
| Idaho | 1,377 | 187 | 11.96 | 1,352 | 157 | 10.4 | 25 | 30 | 54.55 | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois | 6,028 | 153 | 2.47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 6,028 | 153 |
| Indiana | 3,285 | 66 | 1.61 | 3,183 | 37 | 0.92 | 102 | 29 | 46.77 | 0 | 0 |
| lowa | 39 | 8 | 1.59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 5 | 1.2 | 0 | 3 |
| Kansas | 1,239 | 20 | 1.43 | 1,236 | 15 | 1.2 | 117 | 28 | 19.31 | -114 | -23 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 113 | 5.66 | 3,968 | 113 | 5.82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3,968 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 2,142 | 124 | 5.46 | 2,122 | 123 | 5.48 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Maine | 897 | 34 | 3.65 | 865 | 34 | 3.78 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland | 4,002 | 247 | 5.81 | 3,810 | 103 | 2.63 | 192 | 144 | 42.86 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 1,335 | 28 | 2.05 | 1,245 | 27 | 2.12 | 90 | 1 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Michigan | 5,592 | 115 | 2.02 | 5,521 | 47 | 0.84 | 71 | 68 | 53.97 | 0 | 0 |


| UOCAVA Table 5: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Uniformed Services Members |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Minnesota | 2,890 | 119 | 3.93 | 2,779 | 116 | 3.98 | 111 | 3 | 2.65 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 1,262 | 14 | . | 1,262 | 14 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri | 4,107 | 0 | 0 | 3,866 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montana | 2,490 | 20 | 0.8 | 2,476 | 17 | 0.68 | 14 | 3 | 17.65 | 0 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 796 | 22 | 2.69 | 744 | 22 | 2.87 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nevada | 2,677 | 27 | 1 | 2,553 | 19 | 0.74 | 124 | 8 | 6.06 | 0 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 1,637 | 64 | 3.77 | 1,625 | 62 | 3.68 | 12 | 2 | 14.29 | 0 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 1,784 | 24 | . | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1,784 | 24 |
| New Mexico | 1,993 | 21 | 1.07 | 1,219 | 4 | 0.22 | 69 | 15 | 13.39 | 705 | 2 |
| New York | 6,236 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,236 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 6,317 | 99 | 0.91 | 5,536 | 94 | 0.93 | 781 | 5 | 0.64 | 0 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 819 | 31 | 3.65 | 819 | 31 | 3.65 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 6,573 | 96 | 1.36 | 6,358 | 63 | 0.92 | 211 | 29 | 12.13 | 4 | 4 |
| Oklahoma | 2,560 | 149 | 5.68 | 2,155 | 52 | 2.45 | 405 | 97 | 19.32 | 0 | 0 |
| Oregon | 4,149 | 103 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4,149 | 103 |
| Pennsylvania | 7,788 | 94 | 1.21 | 2,897 | 30 | 0.42 | 581 | 1 | 0.17 | 4,310 | 63 |
| Puerto Rico | 324 | 0 | 0 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 3,391 | 24 | 0.52 | 3,391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 24 |
| South Dakota | 1,582 | 46 | 3.38 | 1,571 | 42 | 3.16 | 1 | 1 | 3.23 | 10 | 3 |
| Tennessee | 7,266 | 241 | 3.23 | 7,090 | 162 | 2.25 | 176 | 70 | 26.22 | 0 | 9 |
| Texas | 19,364 | 1,136 | 6.46 | 15,898 | 580 | 3.49 | 488 | 435 | 43.76 | 2,978 | 1 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 6 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 |
| Utah | 1,476 | 0 |  | 1,383 | 0 |  | 93 | 22 |  | 0 | -22 |


| UOCAVA Table 5: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Uniformed Services Members |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Vermont | 287 | 4 | 1.7 | 287 | 4 | 1.7 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 6,143 | 245 | 5.36 | 5,916 | 225 | 5.21 | 227 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 32,472 | 536 | 1.65 | 31,678 | 517 | 1.61 | 307 | 19 | 5.72 | 487 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 1,577 | 5 | 0.51 | 1,534 | 1 | 0.11 | 43 | 4 | 7.27 | 0 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 2,690 | 17 | 0.58 | 2,666 | 13 | 0.45 | 24 | 4 | 12.12 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 434 | 6 | 1.38 | 432 | 6 | 1.38 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 252,574 | 8,539 | 3.41 | 216,308 | 5,808 | 2.4 | 5,674 | 1,643 | 20 | 30,592 | 1,088 |

UOCAVA Table 5 Calculation Notes
(1) All UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Total Counted uses question B9a.
(2) All UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Total Rejected uses question B15a.
(3) All UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Rejection Rate uses question B15a divided by the sum of question B26b and B31a. (4) Regular Absentee Ballots, Uniformed Services Members, Counted uses question B10a. (5) Regular Absentee Ballots, Uniformed Services Members, Rejected uses question B16a.
(6) Regular Absentee Ballots, Uniformed Services Members, Rejection Rate uses question B16a divided by B26b. (7) FWABs, Uniformed Services Members, Counted uses question B11a.
(8) FWABs, Uniformed Services Members, Rejected uses question B17a.
(9) FWABs, Uniformed Services Members, Rejection Rate uses question B17a divided by B31a.
(10) Other Ballots, Uniformed Services Members, Counted uses question B9a minus the sum of questions B10a and B11a.
(11) Other Ballots, Uniformed Services Members, Rejected uses question B15a minus the sum of questions B16a and B17a.
General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than $100 \%$ due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.
California: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).
Connecticut: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Florida: One jurisdiction did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a).
its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).
Kansas: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. For this report, the number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).
Kentucky: The state did not report B8a, the total number of ballots counted, that was used in this column. However, in the B9-12 battery, they did report B9c,
B10a, and B10b, for a total of 6,754 ballots counted.
Mississippi: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
New Jersey: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
jursdictions did sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a)
Oregon: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Rhode Island: The state did not provide a breakdown of voter type for counted or rejected ballots.
Texas: Some jurisdictions reported ballots counted from Military spouses in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sun heir parts (B10a, B11a and B12a). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).
Virginia: Ballots counted from Military spouses were reported in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. Ballots rejected from Military spouses were reported in B15c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B15a.
Wisconsin: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).

| UOCAVA Table 6: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Overseas Citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UoCAVA Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Alabama | 959 | 17 | 1.53 | 875 | 7 | 0.65 | 19 | 10 | 34.48 | 65 | 0 |
| Alaska | 1,800 | 157 | 8.02 | 1,758 | 104 | 5.59 | 42 | 53 | 55.79 | 0 | 0 |
| Arizona | 7,520 | 53 | 0.7 | 7,326 | 36 | 0.49 | 94 | 8 | 7.08 | 100 | 9 |
| Arkansas | 681 | 53 | 5.91 | 607 | 48 | 5.38 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 5 |
| California | 59,792 | 2,806 | 5.15 | 55,889 | 2,494 | 4.83 | 2,330 | 274 | 9.39 | 1,573 | 38 |
| Colorado | 16,241 | 217 | 1.32 | 16,171 | 214 | 1.31 | 70 | 3 | 4.11 | 0 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 3,691 | 76 |  | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | 0 |  | 3,691 | 76 |
| Delaware | 1,068 | 33 | 2.88 | 1,021 | 11 | 1.02 | 47 | 22 | 31.43 | 0 | 0 |
| District of Columbia | 4,062 | 176 | 4.26 | 3,148 | 110 | 3.38 | 914 | 66 | 7.59 | 0 | 0 |
| Florida | 28,342 | 836 | 2.88 | 28,034 | 725 | 2.53 | 301 | 110 | 29.89 | 7 | 1 |
| Georgia | 7,229 | 647 | 8.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7,229 | 647 |
| Guam | 40 | 2 | 4.65 | 40 | 2 | 4.76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 504 | 9 | 1.67 | 431 | 1 | 0.19 | 1 | 8 | 50 | 72 | 0 |
| Idaho | 1,021 | 195 | 16.04 | 1,000 | 154 | 13.34 | 21 | 40 | 64.52 | 0 | 1 |
| Illinois | 15,322 | 384 | 2.44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 15,322 | 384 |
| Indiana | 3,595 | 58 | 0.93 | 3,551 | 29 | 0.47 | 44 | 29 | 35.8 | 0 | 0 |
| lowa | 40 | 3 | 0.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Kansas | 2,449 | 33 | 1.27 | 2,449 | 24 | 0.97 | 82 | 45 | 35.71 | -82 | -36 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 61 | 2.94 | 2,786 | 61 | 2.97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2,786 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 2,086 | 143 | 6.41 | 2,060 | 143 | 6.49 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Maine | 3,152 | 134 | 4.07 | 3,050 | 134 | 4.2 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland | 11,551 | 964 | 7.7 | 10,911 | 639 | 5.53 | 640 | 325 | 33.68 | 0 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 17,946 | 157 | 0.87 | 17,276 | 154 | 0.88 | 670 | 3 | 0.45 | 0 | 0 |
| Michigan | 11,163 | 317 | 2.76 | 11,054 | 231 | 2.04 | 109 | 86 | 46.74 | 0 | 0 |


| U0CAVA Table 6: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Overseas Citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All UOCAVA Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Minnesota | 8,711 | 832 | 8.66 | 8,478 | 820 | 8.76 | 233 | 12 | 4.92 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 827 | 5 |  | 827 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | 0 |
| Missouri | 4,316 | 0 | 0 | 4,121 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montana | 1,737 | 13 | 0.74 | 1,724 | 13 | 0.75 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 1,135 | 73 | 6.04 | 1,068 | 73 | 6.4 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nevada | 3,613 | 57 | 1.55 | 3,465 | 46 | 1.31 | 148 | 11 | 6.92 | 0 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 3,291 | 192 | 5.53 | 3,248 | 186 | 5.43 | 43 | 6 | 12.24 | 0 | 0 |
| New Jersey | 13,319 | 140 |  | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | 0 | . | 13,319 | 140 |
| New Mexico | 1,414 | 5 | 0.38 | 1,244 | 2 | 0.16 | 55 | 2 | 3.13 | 115 | 1 |
| New York | 34,894 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,894 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 10,884 | 122 | 0.73 | 10,037 | 110 | 0.7 | 847 | 12 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 632 | 18 | 2.77 | 632 | 18 | 2.77 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 11,304 | 169 | 1.52 | 11,061 | 108 | 0.99 | 247 | 53 | 18.21 | -4 | 8 |
| Oklahoma | 1,693 | 85 | 4.9 | 1,529 | 43 | 2.81 | 164 | 42 | 20.39 | 0 | 0 |
| Oregon | 5,063 | 85 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 5,063 | 85 |
| Pennsylvania | 14,539 | 532 | 3.66 | 3,701 | 118 | 0.87 | 904 | 7 | 0.77 | 9,934 | 407 |
| Puerto Rico | 286 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 3,429 | 18 | 0.45 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 3,405 | 18 |
| South Dakota | 1,032 | 46 | 6.81 | 1,029 | 43 | 6.51 | 1 | 1 | 7.14 | 2 | 2 |
| Tennessee | 3,614 | 229 | 6.07 | 3,541 | 187 | 5.12 | 74 | 45 | 37.19 | -1 | -3 |
| Texas | 21,095 | 982 | 6.49 | 17,766 | 534 | 3.77 | 454 | 388 | 39.96 | 2,875 | 60 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Utah | 2,466 | 0 |  | 2,375 | 0 |  | 91 | 68 |  | 0 | -68 |


| UOCAVA Table 6: UOCAVA Ballots Counted and Rejected by Type of Ballot, Overseas citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Uocava Ballots |  |  | Regular Absentee Ballots |  |  | FWAB |  |  | Other Types |  |
|  | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected | Rejection Rate | Counted | Rejected |
| Vermont | 1,775 | 67 | 3.77 | 1,775 | 67 | 3.77 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 5,553 | 511 | 8.35 | 5,266 | 446 | 7.74 | 287 | 65 | 18.36 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 21,553 | 669 | 3.05 | 20,813 | 601 | 2.83 | 628 | 68 | 9.86 | 112 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 683 | 6 | 0.89 | 673 | 2 | 0.3 | 10 | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 3,394 | 26 | 0.7 | 3,386 | 9 | 0.24 | 8 | 17 | 68 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 390 | 9 | 2.26 | 390 | 9 | 2.26 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 382,896 | 12,422 | 3.4 | 277,896 | 8,761 | 2.48 | 10,021 | 1,886 | 14.29 | 94,979 | 1,775 |

UOCAVA Table 6 Calculation Notes
(1) All UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Total Counted uses question B9b. (2) All UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Total Rejected uses question B15b.
(3) All Uocava Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Rejection Rate uses question B15b divided by the sum of question B26c and B31b. (4) Regular Absentee Ballots, Overseas Civilians, Counted uses question B10b. (5) Regular Absentee Ballots, Overseas Civilians, Rejected uses question B16b.
(6) Regular Absentee Ballots, Overseas Civilians, Rejection Rate uses question B16b divided by B26c.
(7) FWABs, Overseas Civilians, Counted uses question B11b.
(8) FWABs, Overseas Civilians, Rejected uses question B17b.
(9) FWABs, Overseas Civilians, Rejection Rate uses question B17b divided by B31b.
(10) Other Ballots, Overseas Civilians, Counted uses question B9b minus the sum of questions B10b and B11b.
(11) Other Ballots, Overseas Civilians, Rejected uses question B15b minus the sum of questions B16b and B17b. General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than 100\% due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.

## UOCAVA Table 6 Data Notes

Iowa: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from overseas civilians, B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts
(B10b, B11b and B12b).
Kansas: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from overseas civilians, B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from overseas civilians, B15b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16b, B17b and B18b).
Kentucky: The state did not report B8a, the total number of ballots counted, that was used in this column. However, in the B9-12 battery, they did report B9c, B10a, and B10b, for a total of 6,754 ballots counted.
Rhode Island: The state did not provide a breakdown of voter type for counted or rejected ballots.
Texas: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from overseas civilians, B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).


UOCAVA Table 7: UOCAVA Ballots Received, Counted, and Rejected as Percent of Transmitted, Uniformed Services Members

|  | Transmitted | Received |  | Counted |  | Rejected |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted | Total | Pct. <br> Transmitted |
| Ohio | 8,566 | 7,058 | 82.4 | 6,573 | 76.73 | 96 | 1.12 |
| Oklahoma | 4,359 | 2,622 | 60.15 | 2,560 | 58.73 | 149 | 3.42 |
| Oregon | 6,047 | 0 | 0 | 4,149 | 68.61 | 103 | 1.7 |
| Pennsylvania | 10,833 | 7,788 | 71.89 | 7,788 | 71.89 | 94 | 0.87 |
| Puerto Rico | 642 | 324 | 50.47 | 324 | 50.47 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 0 |  |
| South Carolina | 4,614 | 4,614 | 100 | 3,391 | 73.49 | 24 | 0.52 |
| South Dakota | 1,716 | 1,360 | 79.25 | 1,582 | 92.19 | 46 | 2.68 |
| Tennessee | 9,374 | 7,467 | 79.66 | 7,266 | 77.51 | 241 | 2.57 |
| Texas | 29,062 | 17,594 | 60.54 | 19,364 | 66.63 | 1,136 | 3.91 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 13 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46.15 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah | 3,065 | 0 | 0 | 1,476 | 48.16 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermont | 406 | 235 | 57.88 | 287 | 70.69 | 4 | 0.99 |
| Virginia | 7,445 | 4,568 | 61.36 | 6,143 | 82.51 | 245 | 3.29 |
| Washington | 60,473 | 32,488 | 53.72 | 32,472 | 53.7 | 536 | 0.89 |
| West Virginia | 792 | 979 | 123.61 | 1,577 | 199.12 | 5 | 0.63 |
| Wisconsin | 4,686 | 2,911 | 62.12 | 2,690 | 57.4 | 17 | 0.36 |
| Wyoming | 557 | 436 | 78.28 | 434 | 77.92 | 6 | 1.08 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 368,516 | 250,683 | 68.03 | 252,574 | 68.54 | 8,539 | 2.32 |

UOCAVA Table 7 Calculation Notes
(1) Total UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted and FWABs, Uniformed Services Members uses question B1b.
(2) UOCAVA Ballots Received, Uniformed Services Members, Total uses questions B26b and B31a.
(3) UOCAVA Ballots Received, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Transmitted is the number of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received from uniformed services members as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to uniformed services members. It uses the sum of questions B26b and B31a divided by question B1b.
(4) UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Total uses question B9a.
(5) UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Uniformed Services Members, Pct. Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted from uniformed services members as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to uniformed services voters. It uses question B9a divided by question B1b.
(6) UOCAVA Ballots Rejected, Uniformed Service Members, Total uses question B15a.
(7) UOCAVA Ballots Rejected, Uniformed Service Members, Pct. Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were rejected from uniformed services members as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to uniformed services voters. It uses question B15a divided by question B1b.

## UOCAVA Table 7 Data Notes

General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than 100\% due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.
Alabama: Some jurisdictions reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B1b. Some jurisdictions reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b.

California: The state reported a much lower number of ballots transmitted to Uniformed Services members in 2016 than in 2012 due to many of its jurisdictions not categorizing transmitted ballots by voter type in 2016.

Connecticut: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Florida: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B1b. One jurisdiction did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a).
Hawaii: One jurisdiction reported ballots transmitted to Military dependents in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B1b. Additionally, the jurisdiction with the largest number of transmitted ballots in Hawaii did not categorize those ballots by voter type, so the reported number of ballots transmitted to Uniformed Services Members in 2016 is much lower than in 2012.

Iowa: The state did not categorize its transmitted ballots by voter type.
Kansas: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from Uniformed Services Members, B9a. For this report, the number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10a, B11a and B12a). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).
Mississippi: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
New Jersey: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
New Mexico: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).

Oregon: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Rhode Island: The state did not provide a breakdown of voter type for transmitted, received, counted or rejected ballots.

Texas: Some jurisdictions reported ballots transmitted to Military spouses in B1d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B1b. Some jurisdictions reported ballots counted from Military spouses in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. Some jurisdictions did not report B9a, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of their parts (B10a, B11a and B12a). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B15a, so those numbers were backfilled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a). Additionally, one jurisdiction reported ballots received from Military spouses in B26d. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B26b

Virginia: Ballots counted from Military spouses were reported in B9c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B9a. Ballots rejected from Military spouses were reported in B15c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services members category, B15a. FWABs received from Military spouses and their dependents were reported in B31c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B31a.

Wisconsin: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from Uniformed Services members, B 15 a , so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16a, B17a and B18a).

UOCAVA Table 8: UOCAVA Ballots Received, Counted, and Rejected as Percent of Transmitted, Overseas Citizens



|  | Transmitted | Received |  | Counted |  | Rejected |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Total | Pct. Transmitted | Total | Pct. Transmitted |
| Ohio | 13,264 | 11,147 | 84.04 | 11,304 | 85.22 | 169 | 1.27 |
| Oklahoma | 2,489 | 1,735 | 69.71 | 1,693 | 68.02 | 85 | 3.42 |
| Oregon | 6,459 | 0 | 0 | 5,063 | 78.39 | 85 | 1.32 |
| Pennsylvania | 19,351 | 14,540 | 75.14 | 14,539 | 75.13 | 532 | 2.75 |
| Puerto Rico | 244 | 286 | 117.21 | 286 | 117.21 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| South Carolina | 4,004 | 4,004 | 100 | 3,429 | 85.64 | 18 | 0.45 |
| South Dakota | 821 | 675 | 82.22 | 1,032 | 125.7 | 46 | 5.6 |
| Tennessee | 4,572 | 3,771 | 82.48 | 3,614 | 79.05 | 229 | 5.01 |
| Texas | 32,685 | 15,142 | 46.33 | 21,095 | 64.54 | 982 | 3 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Utah | 3,894 | 0 | 0 | 2,466 | 63.33 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Vermont | 2,357 | 1,775 | 75.31 | 1,775 | 75.31 | 67 | 2.84 |
| Virginia | 7,619 | 6,119 | 80.31 | 5,553 | 72.88 | 511 | 6.71 |
| Washington | 35,920 | 21,911 | 61 | 21,553 | 60 | 669 | 1.86 |
| West Virginia | 1,379 | 672 | 48.73 | 683 | 49.53 | 6 | 0.44 |
| Wisconsin | 4,598 | 3,722 | 80.95 | 3,394 | 73.81 | 26 | 0.57 |
| Wyoming | 480 | 398 | 82.92 | 390 | 81.25 | 9 | 1.88 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 491,664 | 365,854 | 74.41 | 382,896 | 77.88 | 12,422 | 2.53 |

## UOCAVA Table 8 Calculation Notes

(1) Total UOCAVA Ballots Transmitted and FWABs, Overseas Civilians uses question B1c.
(2) UOCAVA Ballots Received, Overseas Civilians, Total uses questions B26c and B31b.
(3) UOCAVA Ballots Received, Overseas Civilians, Pct. Transmitted is the number of regular UOCAVA ballots and FWABs received from overseas civilians as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to overseas civilians. It uses the sum of questions B26c and B31b divided by question B1c.
(4) UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Total uses question B9b.
(5) UOCAVA Ballots Counted, Overseas Civilians, Pct. Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were counted from overseas civilians as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to overseas civilians. It uses question B9b divided by question B1c.
(6) UOCAVA Ballots Rejected, Overseas Civilians, Total uses question B15b.
(7) UOCAVA Ballots Rejected, Overseas Civilians, Rejected as \% of Transmitted is the number of UOCAVA ballots that were rejected from overseas civilians as a percentage of the total ballots transmitted to overseas civilians. It uses question B15b divided by question B1c.

## UOCAVA Table 8 Data Notes

General note: Some percentages and rates in this table are greater than $100 \%$ due to difference in how states reported transmitted and received ballots.

California: One jurisdiction in California reported ballots counted from permanent overseas citizens in B9c. For this report, they were added to the overseas civilians category, B9b. Additionally, one jurisdiction did not report the number ballots counted for overseas civilians. This number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).
Connecticut: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
lowa: The state did not categorize its transmitted ballots by voter type. Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted for overseas civilians in B9b. For this report, the number was back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).

Kansas: Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots counted from overseas civilians, B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B10b, B11b and B12b). Some jurisdictions did not report the number of ballots rejected from overseas civilians, B15b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of its parts (B16b, B17b and B18b).

Kentucky: The state did not report B8a, the total number of ballots counted, that was used in this column. However, in the B9-12 battery, they did report B9c, B10a, and B10b, for a total of 6,754 ballots counted.

Mississippi: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
New Jersey: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Oregon: The state did not report receiving any UOCAVA ballots.
Rhode Island: The state did not categorize its transmitted, received, counted or rejected ballots by voter type.
Texas: Some jurisdictions did not report B9b, so those numbers were back-filled with the sum of their parts (B10b, B11b and B12b).
Virginia: FWABs received from Military spouses and their dependents were reported in B31c. For this report, they were added to the Uniformed Services Members category, B31a.

## Survey Methodology

Since 2004, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) has conducted the Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS). The EAVS asks all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and four U.S. territories-American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islandsquestions about voter registration, absentee voting, voting by individuals covered by the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), provisional voting, election technology, poll workers and polling places, and total turnout. ${ }^{1}$ The EAVS satisfies the EAC's requirements under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) to serve as a clearinghouse for election data. The sections of the EAVS related to voter registration and UOCAVA voting allows states to satisfy their data reporting requirements established, respectively, by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) and UOCAVA.

The EAVS data reported here reflect the data submitted and certified by 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three U.S. territories (Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands). ${ }^{2}$ Data for each state was collected at the jurisdiction level, with 6,437 of the 6,467 jurisdictions nationwide ( 99 percent) included in data for the 2016 EAVS. Only four states had a jurisdictionlevel response rate under 100 percent: Hawaii, Illinois, and Maine-each had one nonreporting jurisdiction—and Texas was missing data for 27 of its 254 jurisdictions. Appendix A shows the number of jurisdictions and the response rate by state (overall and for each section of the EAVS).

## Survey Questionnaire

The 2016 EAVS questionnaire was the same one used in 2014, except that several questions in the 2016 survey could be skipped. The EAVS is divided into six sections, each of which collects data on a different aspect of voting and election administration:

- Section A is the voter registration section. Questions about the total number of registered voters, the number of new voter registrations, and the sources of voter registrations were included in this section.
- Section B focuses on voting activities related to UOCAVA.
- Section C focuses on domestic civilian absentee ballots.
- Section D collects data on election administration, such as the numbers of precincts, polling places, and election workers.
- Section E asks for information on provisional ballots.
- Section F covers Election Day activities, including voter turnout, use of electronic poll books, and types of voting equipment.

Though the survey instrument was unchanged in 2016, additions and edits were made to the Supplemental Instruction Manual (SIM) so that it was easier to use and contained complete
definitions for all key terms in the survey. The 2016 EAVS consisted of 438 fields that required an answer, but 171 of those fields were "other" categories or comment boxes that were optional to the respondents.

## Revisions to Section B

In 2014, the UOCAVA section of the EAVS was expanded to include questions from the Federal Voting Assistance Program's (FVAP) Post-Election Quantitative Survey of Local Election Officials. The goal of combining the surveys was to reduce the survey burden on election officials by asking them to answer a single set of questions about UOCAVA voting. Although the questions from the two surveys were phrased differently and asked for different levels of specificity, they captured many of the same data points. For example, both surveys asked questions pertaining to ballots transmitted, ballots returned, and ballots rejected. In order to streamline and improve the UOCAVA section in the 2016 EAVS, no response was required for several redundant questions and subitems requesting data that most states do not record. ${ }^{3}$ In the SIM, states were instructed to skip 13 questions with 62 subitems. These items were also grayed out in the data templates. Appendix B lists the questions that were to be skipped and explains what items in the survey replaced the skipped items. A more detailed explanation of the process for streamlining Section B is available in the 2016 EAVS UOCAVA Report.

## The Data Collection Templates

The EAVS data were collected from states-or jurisdictions within states-using two versions of an Excel data template. The data templates were state specific; each state received a version that contained the name and FIPS code for each of its local jurisdictions. Until this year, the EAVS data were collected using an Excel workbook called the Data Entry Template. The Data Entry Template could be viewed either as a worksheet or in a form view, which walked respondents through each survey question.

For the 2016 implementation of the EAVS, a new template, the Data Aggregation Template, was developed. The Data Aggregation Template served several purposes. The template made it easier for states with centralized, top-down election management systems to complete the EAVS at the state level without having to enter data for each jurisdiction individually. For states that sent out the Data Entry Template to their local jurisdictions, the aggregation template could be used to compile responses from each jurisdiction. To facilitate state aggregation of data, the Data Entry Template was updated to include a feature that exported data for all sections of the EAVS onto a single sheet. Data could then be pasted into the Data Aggregation Template to compile a single state submission. An instruction manual and training videos were provided to help with the use of the data templates.

## Data Validation

One of the key issues associated with any data collection project is ensuring that the data collected are accurate. It is relatively easy to make mistakes, such as copying and pasting data into the wrong columns or rows or transposing numbers, when entering data. Both EAVS templates included built-in, "internal" validation checks that flagged specific types of errors. In
addition, data analyses were run to check to see if reported data were very different from the data reported in similar localities. These validations are discussed in more detail below.

## Internal Validations

The EAVS internal validations checked flagged data because they appeared to have been entered incorrectly, based on other data points entered into the template. For example, question C1b in the EAVS asked jurisdictions to report the total number of by-mail absentee ballots that were returned by voters. Question C4a asked how many of the returned ballots were counted, and question C4b asked how many of these ballots were rejected. The internal validations checked that the total number of ballots counted and the total number of ballots rejected equaled the total number of ballots returned. In addition, the internal validations were designed to catch blank cells where necessary information should have been included. ${ }^{4}$

In the Data Entry Template, when a validation check was violated, the corresponding cell was highlighted and the violated rule was reported in an error window. ${ }^{5}$ In the Data Aggregation Template, the error check function reported all internal validation errors in two separate error tabs. One tab reported items that were left blank and another tab listed places where there were internal validation issues. These error tabs listed the errors by jurisdiction, then by question. The validation checks were designed so that if a state's officials thought it had a legitimate reason for violating a validation, they could ignore a validation error and certify that the state's data were complete and accurate to the best of their knowledge.

## External Validations

After each state submitted its data, external validation checks were run to highlight any discrepancies between the "expected" values for certain items and the data reported by the state. These external validation checks were run for the first time in 2016. These checks served as an additional way to flag potential errors in either the data entry or data collection procedures. External validations flagged jurisdictions if the value reported in the 2016 EAVS was significantly higher or lower than might be expected for jurisdictions with similar characteristics (e.g., population, urbanization, median household income, other demographic characteristics).

Although external validations sometimes incorrectly flagged jurisdictions that were outliersfor example, jurisdictions with large military populations were sometimes flagged by external validations in relation to UOCAVA voting-they were particularly effective in identifying cases in which data had been entered into the wrong column or other data layout issues affected accuracy. Based on the initial use of these validations, the EAC learned how these might be improved to better detect true data errors. See Appendix C for a more detailed discussion of the external validation methodology.

## Data Processing

States were given the data templates before the 2016 general election, and states could submit data at any time, with the final deadline for initial, complete submissions being

February 1, 2017. Once submitted, both internal and external validations were run on each state's data. In addition, a state's data submission was examined for completeness. When errors, questions about missing data, or other questions emerged, a memo outlining every issue was prepared, and the data were referred back to the states for review and correction, as appropriate. States had two weeks to review and correct their submissions and certify their state's 2016 EAVS data submission. The final data certification deadline was March 1, 2017. ${ }^{6}$

## Data Reporting and Calculations

All calculations included in the EAVS report used the 2016 jurisdiction-level data provided by each state. Most of the data were reported at the state or national level. State totals were calculated by summing the data from all jurisdictions within a state, and national totals were calculated aggregating the state-level totals. Whenever possible, the EAVS Comprehensive Report uses percentages and rates for comparative purposes. For these computations, items were combined, as necessary, to create the numerator and denominator to produce a percentage or rate. For example, the following formula was used to calculate the percentage of registered voters who voted in the 2016 Presidential Election:

- [ Item F1a (total voters) / Item A1a (registered voters) ] x 100

When jurisdictions did not report data for a particular question (i.e., left the item blank), that cell, as well as any rate derived from that question, was treated as a missing value. When the calculation included items for which a limited number of states or jurisdictions responded, only the data from those jurisdictions that reported all data were included. This decision rule means that there were instances in which the rates that were reported were not available for all 50 states, Washington, D.C., and four U.S. territories. For this reason, the number of jurisdictions that reported data was throughout the EAVS when results are reported (e.g., 47 out of the 55 states and territories provided information about confirmation notices).

## Statutory Overview

The Statutory Overview (SO) survey was distributed to the point of contact (POC) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and four U.S. territories on August 29, 2016. The questionnaire used in 2016 was identical to the one used in 2014. The SO survey was transmitted to each POC by email and was available in a password-protected section of a website used for the EAVS project. The survey was sent as a fillable PDF, with state responses to the 2014 survey included in the document. States were then asked to either confirm that each law or policy that was asked about in the survey had not changed between 2014 and 2016. States were asked to submit their completed SO surveys by September 30, 2016. All jurisdictions except for American Samoa responded to the survey.

Once all of the responses were received, analysts and subject matter experts reviewed the 2016 responses by examining the descriptive phrases used for each category. States often use different wording to describe the same concept, and analysts looked for the common
denominator in the responses for purposes of coding the response. A data set was created by examining the key features of each question captured.

## Data Quality Improvement Through Training and Technical Assistance

In 2016, the EAC continued its efforts to improve the EAVS and SO survey instruments and to provide effective technical assistance. In the months preceding the survey administration, preparations were made to simplify the process of completing the EAVS and to address challenges faced by state and local election officials completing the survey. For example, the EAC used feedback gathered from the states-especially the EAVS state POC-and other stakeholders to improve the 2016 EAVS process and provide effective outreach to jurisdictions. Changes made to the EAVS included revising the SIM, improving the Excel Data Entry Template, and creating a Data Aggregation Template. The EAC also conducted two webinars and created a set of videos explaining how to use the data templates and providing a detailed, question-by-question description of each section of the survey.

## Revisions to the SIM

Based on feedback received from state POCs and other stakeholders, revisions were made to the SIM. The purpose of the SIM is to provide states with additional instructions for completing the EAVS and more in-depth explanations of what the questions are asking. In 2016, the instructions for each question were updated to address some of the issues and confusion expressed by the states. ${ }^{7}$ Some of the updates to the SIM clarified the definitions of terms used in the survey. For example, the 2016 SIM provides definitions for "active voter" and "inactive voter" that states should use to answer question A2 and subsequent questions in the survey. Additionally, more descriptive language was added to the 2016 SIM to make it clearer for how to answer certain questions. For example, the descriptions of the different types of registration-such as new valid registrations, new pre-registrations, and invalid or rejected registrations-that question A5 refers to were added to the SIM.

## Webinars and "Boot Camp" Videos

In addition to revisions in the SIM, new resources were developed to assist states with the EAVS process. To help states prepare for the 2016 EAVS, a webinar was conducted on August 31, 2016. The goal of this webinar was to describe steps that states could take in advance to be ready for the data collection phase. On December 5, 2016, a second webinar was conducted that highlighted the steps for completing the EAVS and submitting data. During each webinar, email and direct messaging capabilities were available for listeners to submit their questions and for EAC to answer them live. The webinars were recorded and posted on the EAVS portal so that they could be viewed at any time.

Several other videos were created as a part of the EAC's effort to ease the completion of the EAVS. A data "Boot Camp" video was created for each section of the EAVS. This video series walked through each section of the survey, question by question, explaining the meaning of the question and the type of data that should and should not be included in the reported numbers.

A set of EAVS technical boot camp videos were also created. These videos demonstrated how to use a few EAVS resources, including the EAVS portal and the EAVS data templates.

## Technical Assistance

Technical assistance was provided throughout the entire EAVS process by the EAVS team. Two elections subject matter experts were available at all times to handle more challenging questions and assistance requests. During the busiest data collection period from January through March 2017, an additional team of nine trained technical assistants was available to assist states with data collection and submission. The technical assistance help desk answered inquiries via email and phone. In total, the team assisted with more than 400 technical assistance requests over the data collection period.

## Endnotes

${ }^{1}$ The Northern Mariana Islands are not included in the EAVS because this territory did not have representation in Congress at the time HAVA was enacted.
${ }^{2}$ American Samoa did not respond to the EAVS.
${ }^{3}$ FVAP worked with the Council of State Government's Overseas Voting Initiative to create a working group consisting of state and local election officials. This group identified ways to streamline and improve Section B of the EAVS by removing redundant and particularly challenging questions. The subitems that were removed were related to ballots transmitted to voters 45 days before the election and then ballots transmitted closer to the election. However, most states do not track the date that each ballot was transmitted in a way that could be used to answer this question.
${ }^{4}$ In some cases, cells were left blank because the question was not applicable (N/A) or data were not available (also N/A).
${ }^{5}$ See Methodology Appendix A for the complete list of internal validation rules.
${ }^{6}$ Data were received from 54 states and territories by the March 1, 2017 deadline.
${ }^{7}$ These improvements were made based upon recommendations made by the CSG Section B working group.

## Methodology Appendix A: <br> Survey Response Rates

| Survey Response Rates, by Section (A-C) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Section A |  | Section B |  | Section C |  |
|  | Total Jurisdictions | Total Responding | Response Rate | CVAP <br> Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate |
| Alabama | 67 | 67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Alaska | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Arizona | 15 | 15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.93 |
| Arkansas | 75 | 75 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| California | 58 | 58 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Colorado | 64 | 64 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Connecticut | 169 | 169 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Delaware | 3 | 3 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| District of Columbia | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Florida | 67 | 67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Georgia | 159 | 159 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Guam | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hawaii | 5 | 4 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| Idaho | 44 | 44 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Illinois | 110 | 109 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Indiana | 92 | 92 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Iowa | 99 | 99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Kansas | 105 | 105 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Kentucky | 120 | 120 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Louisiana | 64 | 64 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Maine | 501 | 500 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.98 |
| Maryland | 24 | 24 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Massachusetts | 351 | 351 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.98 |
| Michigan | 83 | 83 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Minnesota | 87 | 87 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mississippi | 82 | 82 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Missouri | 116 | 116 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |


| Survey Response Rates, by Section (A-C) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Jurisdictions | Total Responding | Section A |  | Section B |  | Section C |  |
|  |  |  | Response Rate | CVAP <br> Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate |
| Montana | 56 | 56 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Nebraska | 93 | 93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Nevada | 17 | 17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| New Hampshire | 320 | 320 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| New Jersey | 21 | 21 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.98 |
| New Mexico | 33 | 33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| New York | 62 | 62 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| North Carolina | 100 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| North Dakota | 53 | 53 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ohio | 88 | 88 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Oklahoma | 77 | 77 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Oregon | 36 | 36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 67 | 67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Puerto Rico | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Rhode Island | 39 | 39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| South Carolina | 46 | 46 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| South Dakota | 66 | 66 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Tennessee | 95 | 95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Texas | 254 | 227 | 0.88 | 0.95 | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 0.95 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Utah | 29 | 29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Vermont | 246 | 246 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Virginia | 133 | 133 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.99 |
| Washington | 39 | 39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| West Virginia | 55 | 55 | 1.00 |  | 0.74 |  | 0.95 |  |
| Wisconsin | 1854 | 1854 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Wyoming | 23 | 23 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 6467 | 6437 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.98 |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Survey Response Rates, by Section (D-F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Section D |  | Section E |  | Section F |  |
|  | Total Jurisdictions | Total Responding | Response Rate | CVAP <br> Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate | Response Rate | CVAP Response Rate |
| New Mexico | 33 | 33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| New York | 62 | 62 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| North Carolina | 100 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| North Dakota | 53 | 53 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ohio | 88 | 88 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Oklahoma | 77 | 77 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Oregon | 36 | 36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.25 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Pennsylvania | 67 | 67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Puerto Rico | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Rhode Island | 39 | 39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| South Carolina | 46 | 46 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| South Dakota | 66 | 66 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.89 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Tennessee | 95 | 95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Texas | 254 | 227 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 0.77 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.94 |
| U.S. Virgin Islands | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.59 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Utah | 29 | 29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Vermont | 246 | 246 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Virginia | 133 | 133 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Washington | 39 | 39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| West Virginia | 55 | 55 | 1.00 |  | 0.10 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Wisconsin | 1854 | 1854 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Wyoming | 23 | 23 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 6467 | 6437 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.98 |

## Methodology Appendix B: Validation Rules

Table 1: Internal Validation Rules - Data Entry Template

| Data Entry Template Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Validation Rule | Error Text |
| If A2 "Jurisdiction uses only active voters" is not selected, the sum of A3a and A3b cannot exceed A1. | If "Jurisdiction only uses active registered voters" is not selected (A2), the sum of Active (A3a) and Inactive (A3b) registered persons cannot exceed the total number of persons who are registered to vote in jurisdiction (A1a). |
| The sum of A5b-I cannot exceed A5a. | The sum of the various types of total forms received (A5b-A5I) cannot exceed the total number of forms received (A5a). |
| The sum of A6a-o cannot exceed A5a. | The sum of the various sources of total forms received (A6aA6o) cannot exceed the total number of forms received (A5a). |
| The sum of A7a-o cannot exceed A5b. | The sum of the various sources of new, valid registrations (A7aA7o) cannot exceed the total number of new, valid registrations excluding pre-registrations of persons under 18 (A5b). |
| The sum of A8a-o cannot exceed A5d. | The sum of the various sources of duplicate registrations (A8aA8o) cannot exceed the total number of duplicate or existing registrations (A5d). |
| The sum of A9a-o cannot exceed A5e. | The sum of the various sources of invalid or rejected registrations (A9a-A9o) cannot exceed the total number of invalid or rejected registrations other than duplicate registrations (A5e). |
| The sum of A7a + A8a + A9a cannot exceed A6a. | The sum of mail, fax, or email new registrations (A7a), duplicate or existing registrations (A8a), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9a) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from individual voters submitting by mail, fax, or email (A6a). |
| The sum of $A 7 b+A 8 b+A 9 b$ cannot exceed A6b. | The sum of in-person new registrations (A7b), duplicate or existing registrations (A8b), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9b) cannot exceed the total number of registrations in person at the election/registrar's office (A6b). |


| Data Entry Template Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Validation Rule | Error Text |
| The sum of $A 7 c+A 8 c+A 9 c$ cannot exceed A6c. | The sum of internet new registrations (A7c), duplicate or existing registrations (A8c), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9c) cannot exceed the total number of registrations forms submitted via the internet (A6c). |
| The sum of $A 7 d+A 8 d+A 9 d$ cannot exceed A6d. | The sum of motor vehicle or other drivers' license offices new registrations (A7d), duplicate or existing registrations (A8d), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9d) cannot exceed motor vehicle or other drivers' license offices forms received (A6d). |
| The sum of A7e + A8e + A9e cannot exceed A6e. | The sum of public assistance offices new registrations (A7e), duplicate or existing registrations (A8e), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9e) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from public assistance offices (A6e). |
| The sum of $A 7 f+A 8 f+$ A9f cannot exceed A6f. | The sum of State-funded agencies new registrations (A7f), duplicate or existing registrations (A8f), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9f) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from State-funded agencies (A6f). |
| The sum of $A 7 g+A 8 g+A 9 g$ cannot exceed A6g. | The sum of Armed Forces recruitment offices new registrations (A7g), duplicate or existing registrations (A8g), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9g) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from Armed Forces recruitment offices (A6g). |
| The sum of A7h + A8h + A9h cannot exceed A6h. | The sum of other agencies designated by the State but not mandated by NVRA new registrations (A7h), duplicate or existing registrations (A8h), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9h) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from other agencies designated by the State but not mandated by NVRA (A6h). |
| The sum of $A 7 i+A 8 i+A 9 i$ cannot exceed A6i. | The sum of registration drives from advocacy groups' new registrations (A7i), duplicate or existing registrations (A8i), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9i) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from registration drives from advocacy groups' new registrations (A6i). |
| The sum of A7j + A8j + A9j cannot exceed A6j. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7j), duplicate or existing registrations (A8j), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9j) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6j). |
| The sum of $A 7 k+A 8 k+A 9 k$ cannot exceed A6k. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7k), duplicate or existing registrations (A8k), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9k) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6k). |


| Data Entry Template Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Validation Rule | Error Text |
| The sum of A7I + A8I + A91 cannot exceed A6I. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7I), duplicate or existing registrations (A8I), and invalid or rejected registrations (A91) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6I). |
| The sum of $A 7 m+A 8 m+A 9 m$ cannot exceed A6m. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7m), duplicate or existing registrations (A8m), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9m) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6m). |
| The sum of $A 7 n+A 8 n+A 9 n$ cannot exceed A6n. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7n), duplicate or existing registrations (A8n), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9n) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6n). |
| The sum of $\mathrm{A} 7 \mathrm{o}+\mathrm{A} 80+\mathrm{A} 9 \mathrm{o}$ cannot exceed A6o. | The sum of "Other" new registrations (A7o), duplicate or existing registrations (A80), and invalid or rejected registrations (A9o) cannot exceed the total number of forms received from "Other" sources (A6o). |
| A10a should not exceed 30\% of A1. | The total removal notices sent to voters between close of 2014 election registration and close of 2016 election registration (A10a) cannot be more than $30 \%$ of the total number of persons who are registered to vote in a jurisdiction (A1a). |
| The sum of A10b-A10h cannot exceed A10a. | The sum of the categories of removal notices sent (A10Total) cannot exceed the total number of removal notices sent to voters between close of 2014 election registration and close of 2016 election registration (A10a). |
| The sum of A11b-k cannot exceed A11a. | The sum of the categories of reasons why voters were removed (A11Total) cannot exceed the total number of voters removed from the voter registration rolls (A11a). |
| B1a should not exceed 2.5\% of A1. | The total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters (B1a) cannot be more than $2.5 \%$ of the total number of persons who are registered to vote in a jurisdiction (A1a). |
| The sum of B1b-e cannot exceed B 1 a . | The sum of the categories of types of UOCAVA ballots transmitted (B1Total) cannot exceed the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters (B1a). |
| The sum of B2a-g cannot exceed B1a. | The sum of the categories of what happened to UOCAVA ballots that were transmitted (B2Total) cannot exceed the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters (B1a). |


| Data Entry Template Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Validation Rule | Error Text |
| The sum of B9a + B9b + B9c cannot exceed B8a. | The sum of the categories of UOCAVA voter types counted (B9Total) cannot exceed the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted (B8a). |
| The sum of B10a + B11a + B12a cannot exceed B9a. | The sum of uniformed service absentee ballots counted (B10a), FWABs counted, and "Other" types of ballot counted (B12a) cannot exceed all ballots counted from uniformed service voters (B9a). |
| The sum of B10b + B11b + B12b cannot exceed B9b. | The sum of civilian overseas absentee ballots counted (B10b), FWABs counted (B11b), and "Other" types of ballot counted (B12b) cannot exceed all civilian overseas ballots that were counted (B9b). |
| The sum of $B 10 c+B 11 c+B 12 c$ cannot B9c. | The sum of Other UOCAVA voter absentee ballots counted (B10c), FWABs counted (B11c), and "Other" types of ballot counted (B12c) cannot exceed all Other UOCAVA voter ballots that were counted (B9c). |
| The sum of B14a-f cannot exceed B13a. | The sum of the subcategories of rejected UOCAVA ballots (B14Total) cannot exceed the total number of UOCAVA ballots rejected (B13a). |
| The sum of B15a + B15b $+B 15 c$ cannot exceed B13a. | The sum of the subcategories of types of rejected UOCAVA voters (B15Total) cannot exceed the total number of rejected UOCAVA ballots (B13a). |
| The sum of B16a + B17a + B18a cannot exceed B15a. | The total number of uniformed services voters UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected (B16a), FWABs rejected (B17a), and "Other" types of ballot rejected (B18a) cannot exceed the total number of UOCAVA ballots rejected from uniformed services voters (B15a). |
| The sum of B16b + B17b + B18b cannot exceed B15b. | The total number of civilian overseas UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected (B16b), FWABs rejected (B17b), and "Other" types of ballot rejected (B18b) cannot exceed all civilian overseas UOCAVA ballots rejected (B15b). |
| The sum of B16c + B17c + B18c cannot exceed B15c. | The total number of Other UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected (B16c), FWABs rejected (B17c), and "Other" types of ballot rejected (B18c) cannot exceed Other UOCAVA ballots rejected (B15c). |
| The sum of C1b-h cannot exceed C1a. | The sum of the categories of what happened to transmitted domestic civilian absentee ballots (C1Total) cannot exceed the total number of transmitted domestic civilian absentee ballots (C1a). |


| Data Entry Template Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Validation Rule | Error Text |
| C3 cannot exceed C1a. | The total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots sent to voters in jurisdiction because they appear on permanent absentee list (C3) cannot exceed the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted (C1a). |
| C4b should not exceed 15\% of C1b. | The number of absentee ballots returned by voters and submitted for counting that were rejected (C4b) should not be more than $15 \%$ of the number of absentee ballots transmitted to voters and returned by voters and submitted for counting (C1b). |
| The sum of C4a-d cannot exceed C1b. | The sum of the categories of the outcomes of the absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting (C4Total) cannot exceed the number of absentee ballots transmitted to voters and returned by voters and submitted for counting (C1b). |
| The sum of C5a-v cannot exceed C4b. | The sum of the subcategories of rejected domestic civilian absentee ballots (C5Total) cannot exceed the number of absentee ballots returned by voters and submitted for counting that were rejected (C4b). |
| The sum of D2b-g cannot exceed D2a. | The sum of the categories of physical polling places (D2Total) cannot exceed the total number of physical polling places in your jurisdiction (D2a). |
| The sum of D4a-f cannot exceed D3a. | The sum of the categories of poll worker ages (D4Total) cannot exceed the total number of poll workers in your jurisdiction (D3a). |
| The sum of E1b-f cannot exceed E1a. | The sum of the categories of what happened to the submitted provisional ballots (E1Total) cannot exceed the total number of submitted provisional ballots (E1a). |
| The sum of E2a-p cannot exceed E1d. | The sum of the categories of reasons why provisional ballots were rejected (E2Total) cannot exceed the total number of rejected provisional ballots (E1d). |
| F1a cannot exceed A1. | The number of voting participants (F1a) should not exceed the number of registered voters (A1a). |
| The sum of F1b-j cannot exceed F1a. | The sum of the categories of voting participants (F1Total) should not exceed the total number of voting participants (F1a). |
| If $A 7 a$ is greater than 0 , then F3 cannot exceed $A 7 a$. If $A 7 a$ is null and if A6a is greater than 0 , then F3 cannot exceed A6a. | When A7a is greater than 0 , the number of first-time mail registrants who showed ID and were able to vote (F3) should not exceed new registrants submitting applications by mail, fax or email (A7a). If A7a is null and if the total number of voters submitting applications by mail, fax, or email (A6a) is greater than 0, then F3 cannot exceed A6a. |

Table 2: Internal Validation Rules - Data Aggregation Template

| Validation Rule | Drata |
| :--- | :--- |
| If your state has traditional or same <br> day registration, you should not <br> select "No," "Other," or "Not Applica- <br> ble" in response to A4b. | If a state has traditional or same day registration, in other words <br> they select "Yes" in response to A4b, they should not select <br> or "Not Applicable" in response to A4b. |
| If A10a is greater than 0, then A11a <br> should not exceed A10a. | The total number of voters removed from the voter registration <br> rolls (A11a) cannot exceed the total removal notices sent to <br> voters between close of 2014 election registration and close of <br> 2016 election registration (A10a). |
| If a jurisdiction does not have perma- <br> nent absentee status, you can only <br> mark "No" on question C2. | If a jurisdiction does not have permanent absentee status, you <br> can only mark "No" on question C2. |
| F1d cannot exceed C1a. | If there were more than 0 domestic civilian absentee ballots <br> transmitted to voters (C1a), then the number who voted using <br> a domestic civilian absentee ballot (F1d) should not exceed the <br> total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted <br> (C1a). |
| F1e cannot exceed E1a. | If there were more than 0 total provisional ballots that were <br> submitted (E1a), then the number who voted using a provisional |
| ballot (F1e) cannot exceed the total number of provisional ballots |  |
| submitted (E1a). |  |

## Methodology Appendix C: External Data Validations

## Introduction

The major limitation of only using other items within a complete survey to identify error in a response item is that response items might be perfectly consistent with each other but still contain substantial measurement error. For example, the number of absentee ballots transmitted might be lower than the total number of registrants; this would not violate a validation rule that the transmission number has to be smaller than the registrant number. However, if the total number of registrants is twice the size of the civilian voting age population (CVAP) then both the absentee ballot transmission number and the registration number could be incorrect.

To account for this, the EAC used external data to form an expectation for what each jurisdiction should have reported, based on the jurisdiction's geography and demographics. Responses with the highest probability of having error were those with substantially higher or lower than expected values for that item in 2016, based on the average (logged) count for the counties with similar characteristics (e.g., similar population, urbanization, fraction of foreign born). Each county is unique, so differences between what the local election office (LEO) reports and what we expect does not always represent inaccuracy in what is reported by the LEO. Consequently, the external validations only identified items as potentially mistaken if the discrepancy between what the LEO reported and what was expected was quite large. Generally speaking, only jurisdictions that reported data at the largest or smallest 2.5 percent of respondents were flagged as being outside the expected range.

## Technical Approach

If it is assumed that the probability of an entry in the EAVS being subject to measurement error increases with the difference between what one would expect from a jurisdiction and what the EAVS indicates the count is, then a simple decision rule for identifying suspect entries can take the following form:

$$
\text { Error }=\text { Yes if }\left|\operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)-\operatorname{Ln}\left(1+y_{i}\right)\right|>2 M \text { and No Otherwise }
$$

Where is the relevant count (i.e. number of absentee ballots) for jurisdiction $i$ and is defined as follows:

1) $M=\operatorname{med}\left(\mid\left(\operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)-\operatorname{Ln}\left(1+y_{i}\right)\right)-\operatorname{med}\left(\left(\operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)-\operatorname{Ln}\left(1+y_{i}\right)\right) \mid\right)\right.$

In other words, an entry for a jurisdiction would be identified as being subject to measurement error due to a miss entry if the absolute difference between (the natural $\log ^{1} \mathrm{XXX}$ of ) the entry and the expected (logged) entry for that jurisdiction, from now on referred to as the residual, exceeded seven times the median absolute deviation from the median residual. The choice of
seven is largely arbitrary and can be smaller or larger based on whether one wants to be more conservative or lenient with respect to identifying entries as being subject to measurement error.

The expected logged entry $\widehat{\operatorname{Ln}\left(y_{i}\right)^{2}}$ will vary based on the characteristics of the county. For example, one would typically expect larger counties to have higher counts. The expected (logged) count can be modeled as follows:

$$
\text { 2) } \operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)=\beta X_{i}
$$

Where $X_{i}$ is a vector of determinants of the "true" number of ballots being counted, but which is assumed to not be systematically related to measurement error. Table 1 lists the variables used in these analyses and their sources.

## Table 1. Variable Descriptions and Sources

| Variable | Source |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ln(Voting-Age Population) | 2014 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) |
| \% of Population which is Foreign Born | 2014 5-year ACS |
| Rural-Urban Continuum Codes (Metro >1 mil- <br> lion; 250k-1million;<250k;non-Metro) | US Department of Agriculture |
| Census Division | Census |
| Ln(Median Household Income) | 2014 5-year ACS |
| Two-party Vote Difference in 2012 Presidential <br> Election | Federal Election Commission |
| Electronic Ballot Policies (Accepts Absentee <br> Ballots by Email/Web) | Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) |
| Automatic Registration Policies* | FVAP |
| Ln(Land Area) | Census |
| Ln(Military Employment) | Bureau of Economic Analysis |
| Age (\% 25-34; 35-44; 45-64; 65+) | 2014 5-year ACS |
| \% Female | 2014 5-year ACS |
| Race/Ethnicity (\% Black; Native American; <br> Asian; Hawaiian; Other; Two or More Races; <br> Hispanic) | 2014 5-year ACS |
| Education (\% Some College; College Graduate; <br> Graduate) |  |

*Interacted with Ln(Voting-Age Population).
The challenge in estimating $\beta$ to generate the expected logged counts was that the expected or true counts could not be observed, but rather only what was reported in the EAVS. To the degree that there was substantial measurement error in the EAVS, $\hat{\beta}$ estimated via ordinary least squares (OLS) reflected the relationship between $X_{i}$ and the measurement error and not
just the average marginal effect of $X_{i}$ on $\left(1+y_{i}\right)$, resulting in a biased estimate for $\operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)$. To mitigate this issue, Equation 2 was estimated using robust regression (rreg ${ }^{3 i n}$ Stata), which iteratively re-estimated equation 2 , down weighting observations based on residuals in the previous iteration. This procedure mitigated the influence of measurement error on the final model.

The deviation from the expected logged count $\left(\operatorname{Ln}\left(\widehat{1+y_{i}}\right)-\operatorname{Ln}\left(1+y_{i}\right)\right)$ was calculated, and jurisdictions that had large deviations from the expected response were flagged using the decision rule above. Because some of the predictors $\left(X_{i}\right)$ were measured with error, a relatively conservative decision rule was applied.

## The Auditing Process

For each question in the survey, two items were provided:

1) The "expected" (natural log of 1 plus the) response to that item based on the characteristics of the jurisdiction and responses to the 2016 EAVS. This differed between jurisdictions for a given question.
2) $M$, which captured the variability in the difference between the actual 2016 response and the expected 2016 response. This item varied across questions but would not vary by jurisdiction for a given question.

The following steps were taken for each response in each completed survey:

1) For each greater than zero count, the natural log of 1 plus the count was taken.
2) The absolute difference between the actual 2016 (log transformed) item and the expected (log transformed) item was calculated.
3) The absolute difference was divided by $M$.
4) If the ratio from step 3 exceeded that of step 2 , this item was flagged as having a potential error.

## Endnotes

> ${ }^{1}$ Count variables were typically logged so that 1) the expected $y$ did not take negative values, 2) to minimize the effect of outliers on model estimates, and 3) because the differences in the logs of the predicted and natural counts could be interpreted as a percentile difference, which is arguably of more interest than the absolute difference because it is invariant to jurisdiction size, with the exception of cases where 1) the response was zero and 2) the expected count was close to zero. The analysis took $1+$ the count in order to admit zero observations into the estimates, although this somewhat complicated the interpretation of the coefficients.

2 http://www.stata.com/manuals13/rrreg.pdf

## 2016 Survey Instrument



## U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

## 2016 Election Administration \& Voting Survey

The ongoing process of improving America's election systems relies in part on having accurate data about the way Americans cast their ballots. In 2002, Congress chartered the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to collect information on the state of American elections and make it widely available to policy makers, advocates, scholars, journalists and the general public. Since 2004, the Commission has sponsored a biennial survey as its primary tool for fulfilling that mission. We are pleased to present the 2016 Election Administration and Voting Survey, and we ask for your help in making it the most complete and accurate survey in its history.

The questions below ask for information about ballots cast, voter registration, overseas and military voting, Election Day activities, voting technology, and other important issues. The section concerning the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Voting Act (UOCAVA) serves as the EAC's standardized format for State reporting of UOCAVA voting information as required by 42 U.S.C. §1973ff-1. States that complete and timely submit this section to the EAC will fulfill their UOCAVA reporting requirement under 42 U.S.C. §1973ff-1(c). Additionally, EAC is mandated by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) to collection information from states concerning the impact of that statute on the administration of Federal elections. With this information, EAC is required to make a report to Congress and provide recommendations for the improvement of Federal and State procedures, forms, and other NVRA matters. States that timely respond to all questions in this survey concerning voter registration related matters will meet their NVRA reporting requirements under 42 U.S.C. § $1973 \mathrm{gg}-7$ and EAC regulations.

The EAC recognizes the burden that asking for these data places on State and local election officials, and we have worked to minimize that burden as much as possible.

In advance, we thank you for your cooperation and look forward to answering any questions you might have.

Information supplied by:

| Name |  | Title |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office/Agency name |  |  |  |
| Address 1 |  |  |  |
| Address 2 |  |  |  |
| City |  | State | Zip Code |
| E-mail address |  |  |  |
| Telephone (area code and number) | Extension | Fax $n$ | mber) |

## Instructions for Completing the 2016 Election Administration \& Voting Survey

1. This survey collects information on election administration issues in local election offices (typically counties or townships) that are responsible for the administration of the November 2016 general election. As such, all data should be reported at the level of the local jurisdiction. However, the State or Territorial level election office may fill out any or all of the information on behalf of the local election offices under its jurisdiction.
2. Do not leave items blank - always provide an answer to the question asked using the "Data not available" or "Other" categories discussed below, if needed.
3. Use the "Data not available" box if the question asks for details that are not required by your State law or the question asks for information that is not currently collected.
4. You may find it helpful to read an entire section before answering any of the questions in that section.
5. Please attempt to record data according to the categories as they are defined in the question. If your jurisdiction uses a different data classification scheme (for instance, collects data in such a way that combines two or more categories listed in a question), you can use the space provided for "Other" to provide numbers and details on these categories. Use as many "Other" categories as you need to adequately report the relevant statistics for your jurisdiction. If you enter information into the "Other" field, please use the comments field to provide an explanation for the answer.

In the example below, the jurisdiction does not collect separate statistics on the number of duplicate and rejected registration forms, but instead has only one number that represents the total number of registration forms that are either duplicated or rejected.

## EXAMPLE:

A5. In order to evaluate the workflow of your office over the last election cycle, enter the total number of registration forms your jurisdiction received from all sources during the period from the close of registration for the November 2014 general election until the close of registration for the November 2016 general election. Include here any Election Day or Same Day registrations, if applicable. Also include any special categories of voters who may have extended deadlines, such as returning military personnel, if applicable.

A5a. Total..................................................................................... 5000 ................. $\square$ Data not available
Next, divide the total number of registration application forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in A4a.


## SECTION A

## VOTER REGISTRATION

EAC is mandated by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) to collect information from States concerning the impact of that statute on the administration of Federal elections. With this information EAC is required to make a report to Congress and provide recommendations for the improvement of Federal and State procedures, forms, and other NVRA matters. States that timely respond to all questions in this survey concerning voter registration related matters will meet their NVRA reporting requirements under 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-7 and EAC regulations.

## Roadmap to Section A:

- A1, A2 and A3 ask for information about the number of registered voters in your jurisdiction and how you calculate those statistics.
- A4 asks for information about registration activity on days in which it was possible for a person to both register and vote on the same day.
- A5 asks for information on all registration forms for all types of registration transactions (successful and unsuccessful) received by your office.
- A6 asks for the sources of all registration forms (both successful and unsuccessful).
- A7 asks for the sources of new registrations.
- A8 asks for the sources of duplicate registrations.
- A9 asks for the sources of invalid or rejected registrations.
- A10 asks for information on confirmation notices sent under NVRA Section 8(d) 2.
- A11 asks for the number of voters removed from the voter registration rolls and the reason for their removal.

A1. Enter the total number of persons in your jurisdiction who were registered and eligible to vote in the November 2016 general election. Include all persons eligible to vote in the election including special categories of voters with extended deadlines (such as returning military). Do not include any persons under the age of 18 who may be registered under a "pre-registration" program.

A1a. Total $\qquad$ .................................................Data not available

A1 Comments $\square$

A2. When you report the number of registered voters in your jurisdiction for the November 2016 general election (as in A1a) do you include both active and inactive voters in the count, or does your jurisdiction only include active voters? (Select only one)

A2a. Jurisdiction uses both active and inactive registered voters $\qquad$
A2b. Jurisdiction only uses active registered voters $\qquad$
A2c. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: $\qquad$ ..................................................................................

A2 Comments $\square$

A3. Enter the total number of persons who were registered and eligible to vote in the November 2016 general election into the following categories. Do not include any persons under the age of 18 who may be registered under a "pre-registration" program.

|  | Data not available $\nabla$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| A3a. Active. | $\square$ |
| A3b. Inactive | $\square$ |
| Comments |  |

A4. If your State's laws allowed any voters to register and then to vote on the same day, enter the total number of registration forms received on those days in which it was possible to both register for and vote in the November 2016 general election on the same day. This question includes jurisdictions in States that have formal Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration and those States that have other situations that provide Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration. This question includes jurisdictions in States that permit Election Day Registration for voting for office of President, such as Alaska and Rhode Island.

A4a. Total new Same Day registrations.. $\qquad$ ..Data not available
$\qquad$Not applicable

A4b. Are the numbers you provided for question A4a because your State allows Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration for all voters, or does your answer come from a different circumstance?...Yes, our State has Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration... No, our State does not have formal Election Day Registration or Same Day Registration, but some voters were able to register and vote on the same day for the 2016 election..... Other $\rightarrow$ comments: $\qquad$.... Not applicable.

## A4 Comments

$\square$

A5. In order to evaluate the workflow of your office over the last election cycle, enter the total number of forms your jurisdiction received from all sources during the period from the close of registration for the November 2014 general election until the close of registration for the November 2016 general election. Include any forms that were processed, such as changes to name, party or address, duplicates, or pre-registrations. Include here any Election Day or Same Day registrations, if applicable. Also include any special categories of voters who may have extended deadlines such as returning military personnel, if applicable.

A5a. Total $\qquad$
$\qquad$ ................Data not available

Next, divide the total number of registration application forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in A5a.

|  |  | Data not available |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A5b. New valid registrations (excluding pre-registrations of persons under 18)... |  |  |
| A5c. New "pre" registrations of persons under age 18 ................................... |  |  |
| A5d. Duplicate of existing valid registration................................................... |  |  |
| A5e. Invalid or rejected (other than duplicates) ............................................. |  |  |
| A5f. Changes to name, party or within-jurisdiction address change .................. |  | $\square$ |
| A5g. Address changes that cross jurisdiction borders. |  |  |
| A5h. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A5i. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A5j. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A5k. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A5I. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| TOTAL............................................................................................ | A5a |  |

A5 Comments
$\square$

A6a through A6o: Divide the total number of all registration forms received (as entered in A5a) into the following sources.
A7a through A70: Divide the total number of new registration forms received (as entered in A5b) into the following sources.
A8a through A80: Divide the total number of duplicate registration forms received (as entered in A5d) into the following sources.
A9a through A90: Divide the total number of invalid or rejected registration forms (as entered in A5e) received into the following sources.


[^2]
## A6, A7, A8, and A9 Comments

$\square$

A10. Enter the total number of confirmation notices sent to voters in the period between the close of registration for the November 2014 general election and the close of registration for the November 2016 general election because either 1) there is an indication that the registrant no longer resides in the registrar's jurisdiction, or 2 ) the voter has not voted or appeared to vote in a Federal election during the period.

A10a. Total $\qquad$ ... $\qquad$Data not available

Next, divide the total number of confirmation notices mailed (as entered in A10a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in A10a.


A10 Comments
$\square$

A11. Enter the total number of voters removed from the voter registration rolls in your jurisdiction in the period between the close of registration for the November 2014 general election and the close of registration for the November 2016 general election. Note this question asks for those ineligible to vote, not merely those moved into an "inactive" status.

A11a. Total $\qquad$ ...Data not available

Next, divide the total number of voters removed (as entered in A11a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in A11a.

|  |  | Data not available |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A11b. Moved outside jurisdiction. |  | $\square$ |
| A11c. Death .. |  |  |
| A11d. Disqualifying felony conviction.. |  | $\square$ |
| A11e. Failure to respond to notice sent and failure to vote in the two most recent |  |  |
| Federal elections ... |  | $\square$ |
| A11f. Declared mentally incompetent. |  | $\square$ |
| A11g. Voter requested to be removed for reasons other than felony conviction, mental status, or moved outside jurisdiction $\qquad$ |  | . $\square$ |
| A11h. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A11i. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A11j. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| A11k. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| TOTAL | A11a |  |

A11 Comments
$\square$

## SECTION B UNIFORMED \& OVERSEAS CITIZENS ABSENTEE VOTING ACT (UOCAVA)

For 2016, Section B includes the FVAP Post-Election Voting Survey of Local Election Officials. EAC incorporated these questions for the States' reporting of UOCAVA voting information as required by 42 U.S.C. $\S 1973 \mathrm{ff}$-1. States that complete and timely submit this section to the EAC will fulfill their UOCAVA reporting requirement under 42 U.S.C §1973ff-1(c).

Pursuant to UOCAVA, this section collects various data elements needed to determine: (1) the combined number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters; (2) the combined number of ballots returned by UOCAVA voters; and (3) the combined number of returned ballots cast by UOCAVA voters (the number of cast ballots is practically determined by collecting data concerning the total votes counted and rejected).

## Roadmap to Section B:

- B1 and B2 ask for information about the number and type of UOCAVA absentee ballots transmitted.
- B3 asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- B4, B5, B6, and B7 ask for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot returned by type of UOCAVA voter.
- B8 asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots counted.
- B9, B10, B11, and B12 ask for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot counted by type of UOCAVA voter.
- B13 asks for the number and type of all UOCAVA ballots rejected.
- B14 asks for information on reasons why UOCAVA ballots were rejected.
- B15, B16, B17, and B18 ask for information on the type of UOCAVA ballot rejected by type of UOCAVA voter
- B19 asks for information about the number and type of registered and eligible UOCAVA voters.
- B20, B21, and B22 ask for information concerning the Federal Post Card Applications (FPCAs).
- B23 asks about the date when transmission of absentee ballots to UOCAVA voters began for the November election cycle.
- B24 asks about UOCAVA ballots transmitted by mode of transmission.
- B25 asks about transmitted UOCAVA ballots that were returned as undeliverable by transmission mode.
- B26 and B27 ask about UOCAVA ballots returned by voters, excluding Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs).
- B28 and B29 ask about UOCAVA ballots returned by voters and rejected, excluding FWABS.
- B30 asks about UOCAVA ballots counted by mode of transmission, excluding FWABS.
- B31, B32, B33, B34, and B35 ask for information about FWABs.

B1. Enter the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters for the November 2016 general election.

B1a. Total $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$ Data not available

Next, divide the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters (as entered in B1a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in B1a.


B1 Comments
$\square$

B2. Of the UOCAVA absentee ballots transmitted (as entered in B1a) how many were:


B2 Comments
$\square$

B3. Enter the total number of all UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and Federal Write-in Absentee Ballots (FWABs)) returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting for the November 2016 general election. Please include both those ballots that were later counted and those that were rejected. Do not include ballots that were returned undeliverable.

B3a. Total $\qquad$ .. $\qquad$Data not available

## B3 Comments

$\square$
B4a through B4c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots returned by UOCAVA voters and submitted for counting (as entered in B3) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.

Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:

- B5a through B5c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- B6a through B6c: FWAB returned and submitted for counting.
- B7a through B7c: Other type of ballots returned and submitted for counting.


B4, B5, B6, and B7 Comments
$\square$

B8. Enter the total number of all UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and FWAB) counted in the November 2016 general election.

B8a. Total $\qquad$ .... $\qquad$Data not available

## B8 Comments

$\square$

B9a through B9c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted (as entered in B8) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.

Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:

- B10a through B10c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots counted.
- B11a through B11c: FWAB counted.
- B12a through B12c: Other type of ballots counted.

Type of UOCAVA voter:


B9, B10, B11 and B12 Comments
$\square$

B13. Enter the total number of UOCAVA ballots (including regular UOCAVA absentee ballots and FWAB) rejected in the November 2016 general election.
B13a. Total $\quad \square \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .$.
B13 Comments
$\square$
B14. Please divide the total number of all UOCAVA ballots rejected (as entered in B13a) into the following categories indicating the reason the absentee ballots were rejected. The amounts should sum to the total provided in B13a.

|  |  | Data not av |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B14a. Ballot not received on time/missed deadline. ....................................... |  | $\square$ |
| B14b. Problem with voter signature.. |  |  |
| B14c. Ballot lacked a postmark. |  |  |
| B14d. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| B14e. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| B14f. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| TOTAL .................................................................................................. | B13a |  |

## B14 Comments

$\square$
B15a through B15c. Divide the total number of UOCAVA ballots rejected (as entered in B13a) into each category of UOCAVA voter below.

Next, for each type of UOCAVA voter, enter the number of:

- B16a through B16c: Regular UOCAVA absentee ballots rejected.
- B17a through B17c: FWAB rejected.
- B18a through B18c: Other type of ballots rejected.


B15, B16, B17, and B18 Comments
$\square$

B19. Enter the total number of registered and eligible voters in your jurisdiction who were covered by UOCAVA in the November 2016 General Election.

B19a. Total $\qquad$ ... $\qquad$Data not available

Next, divide the total number of registered and eligible UOCAVA voters (as entered in B19a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in B19a.


B19 Comments
$\square$

B20. Enter the total number of Federal Post Card Applications (FPCAs) received from UOCAVA voters for the November 2016 General Election.

B20a. Total $\qquad$ .Data not available

Next, divide the total number of FPCAs received from UOCAVA voters into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in B20a.


B21. Of the total number of Federal Post Card Applications (FPCAs) that your jurisdiction received as reported in B20a, how many were rejected for the following groups?


B22. Of the total number of Federal Post Card Applications (FPCAs) that were rejected (as reported in B21e), how many were rejected because they were received after the absentee ballot request deadline?

B22a. Total $\qquad$ ... $\qquad$Data not available

B20, B21, and B22 Comments
$\square$

B23. Enter the date your jurisdiction first started transmitting absentee ballots to UOCAVA voters for the November 2016 election. Please provide the exact date your jurisdiction began mailing the ballots. If you do not know the exact date, please enter an approximate date, and select "Approximate" in the box below.

| Month | Day | Approximate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\square$ |

B23 Comments
$\square$

B24. How many UOCAVA absentee ballots did your jurisdiction transmit to UOCAVA voters using the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline?

|  | a. Postal mail |  | b. Email | c. O |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date not available |  | Date not <br> available$\nabla$ |  | Date not available |
| a. Sent ON OR BEFORE the 45 day deadline |  |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |
| b. Sent AFTER the 45 day deadline.. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |
| TOTAL (All UOCAVA voters) |  |  |  |  |  |

B24 Comments
$\square$

B25. Of the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots transmitted how many were returned as undeliverable by the following modes of transmission:

|  | Data not available |
| :---: | :---: |
| B25a. Postal mail .. |  |
| B25b. Email .. |  |
| B25c. Other... |  |
| TOTAL .. |  |

B25 Comments
$\square$

B26. How many UOCAVA absentee ballots were received for the November 2016 general election? Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals.

B26a. Total UOCAVA absentee ballots excluding FWABS $\square$ $\square$ Data not available
Next, divide the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots received (as entered in B26a) into the following categories. Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals. The amounts should sum to the total provided in B26a.



B26 Comments


B27. How many UOCAVA absentee ballots were received using the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline? Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals.

|  | a. Postal mail | b. Email | c. Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date not available | Date not <br> available | Date not available |
| a. Sent ON OR BEFORE the 45 day deadline | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ $\square$ |
| b. Sent AFTER the 45 day deadline... | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |
| B27 Comments |  |  |  |

B28. Of the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots received (as reported in B26a), how many were rejected for the following groups? Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals.
$\underset{\mathbf{v}}{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{D}$


328 Comments


B29. Of the total number of UOCAVA absentee ballots that were rejected (as reported in B28e), how many were rejected because they were received after the statutory deadline by the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline? Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals.


B30. Enter the total number of UOCAVA ballots counted in your jurisdiction by the following modes of transmission, before and after the 45-day deadline. Please EXCLUDE Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) from your totals.

|  | a. Postal mail | b. Email |  | c. Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date not available |  | Date not available |  | Date not available |
| a. Sent ON OR BEFORE the 45 day deadline | $\square$ |  |  |  | $\square$ |
| b. Sent AFTER the 45 day deadline. | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

B31. Enter the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters for the


B32. Of the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters (as reported in B31e), how many were rejected for the following groups?

|  | Data not available |
| :---: | :---: |
| B32a. Uniformed services voters - domestic or foreign ... | $\square$ |
| B32b. Non-military/civilian overseas voters |  |
| B32c. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| B32d. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| B32e. TOTAL ................................................................... |  |

B33. Of the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters that were rejected (as reported in B32e), how many were rejected because they were received after the ballot receipt deadline?

B33a. Total FWABs rejected because received after ballot receipt deadline ........................................... $\square$Data not available

B34. Of the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters that were rejected (as reported in B32e), how many were rejected because the voter's regular absentee ballot was received and counted?

B34a. Total FWABs rejected because voter's regular absentee ballot received and counted $\qquad$
$\square$Data not available

B35. Enter the total number of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots (FWABs) received from UOCAVA voters that were counted for the following groups.


## SECTION C

## Domestic Civilian Absentee Ballots

## Roadmap to Section C

- C1 asks for information about absentee ballots transmitted and the status of the transmitted ballots.
- $\quad \mathbf{C 2}$ and C3 ask for information on any voters who may be registered as permanent absentee voters.
- C4 asks for information on the status of absentee ballots returned and submitted for counting.
- C5 asks for information on the reasons absentee ballots were rejected.

C1. Enter the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted to voters for the November 2016 general election. Do not include absentee ballots transmitted to UOCAVA voters.

C1a. Total $\qquad$ . Data not available

Next, divide the total number of absentee ballots transmitted to voters (as entered in C1a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in C1a.


## C1 Comments

$\square$

C2. Does your jurisdiction have a permanent absentee voter registration list in which voters may apply to receive an absentee (or mail) ballot for subsequent elections without further application? Do not include UOCAVA voters.
$\square$....... Yes $\rightarrow$ Continue to question C3.
$\square \ldots \ldots$ No $\rightarrow$ Skip to question C4.

C2 Comments
$\square$

C3. Of the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots transmitted (as entered in C1a) how many ballots were sent to voters in your jurisdiction because they appear on a permanent absentee (or mail) ballot voter registration list?

C3a. Total
Data not available
C3 Comments
$\square$

C4. Of the total number of absentee ballots returned by voters and submitted for counting (as entered in C1b) how many ballots were:


## C4 Comments

$\square$

C5. Please divide the total number of domestic civilian absentee ballots rejected (as entered in C4b) into the following categories indicating the reason why the absentee ballots were rejected. The amounts should sum to the total provided in C4b.


C5 Comments
$\square$

## SECTION D

## Election Administration

- D1 asks for information on the number of precincts in your jurisdiction.
- D2 asks for information on the number and type of polling places in your jurisdiction.
- D3, D4, and D5 ask for information on poll workers utilized in the November 2016 general election.

D1. Enter the total number of precincts in your jurisdictions for the November 2016 general election.
D1a. Total $\qquad$ ...Data not available

## D1 Comments

$\square$

D2. Enter the total number of physical polling places in your jurisdiction for the November 2016 general election.
Please include physical polling places in operation on Election Day and physical polling places in operation before Election Day (such as early vote centers).

D2a. Total $\square$.............................................. $\square$ Data not available

Next, divide the total physical polling places in your jurisdiction (as entered in D2a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in D2a. If you do not include election offices in your count of polling places, enter 0 .


Election Day voting


## Early voting



## D2 Comments

$\square$

D3. Enter the total number of poll workers used in your jurisdiction for the November 2016 general election.

- Poll workers may include election judges, booth workers, wardens, commissioners, or other similar terms that refer to persons who verify the identity of a voter; assist the voter with signing the register, affidavits or other documents required to cast a ballot; assist the voter by providing the voter with a ballot or setting up the voting machine for the voter; and serving other functions as dictated by State law.
- Include all people recruited specifically for the purposes of working at physical polling places in operation on and/or before Election Day but do not include observers stationed at the polling places or regular office staff.

D3a. Total $\qquad$ ... $\qquad$Data not available

## D3 Comments

$\square$

D4. If your jurisdiction has data on the ages of its poll workers (for example, from voter registration records, from payroll records, or from poll worker applications), enter the total number of poll workers in each age category.

$\square$ Data not available
D4 Comments
$\square$

D5. How difficult or easy was it for your jurisdiction to obtain a sufficient number of poll workers for the November 2016 general election?...... Very difficult...... Somewhat difficult.... Neither difficult nor easy.... Somewhat easy... Very easy...... Not enough information to answer
D5 Comments
$\square$

## SECTION E

## Provisional Ballots

- E1 asks for information on the number and status of provisional ballots submitted.
- E2 asks for information on reasons why provisional ballots were rejected.

E1. Enter the total number of voters who submitted provisional ballots in the November $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ general election.
E1a. Total $\square$ ... $\qquad$ $\square$ Data not available

Next, divide the total number of voters who submitted provisional ballots in the November 2016 general election (as entered in E1a) into the following categories.



## E1 Comments

$\square$

E2. Please divide the total number of provisional ballots rejected (as entered in E1d) into the following categories indicating the reason the provisional ballots were rejected. The amounts should sum to the total provided in E1d.

|  | Data not available |
| :---: | :---: |
| E2a. Voter not registered in the State........................................................... | $\square$ |
| E2b. Voter registered in State but attempted to vote in the wrong jurisdiction....... | $\square$ |
| E2c. Voter registered in State but attempted to vote in the wrong precinct .......... | $\square$ |
| E2d. Failure to provide sufficient identification ............................................... | $\square$ |
| E2e. Envelop and/or ballot was incomplete and/or illegible . | $\square$ |
| E2f. Ballot missing from envelope ................................................................. | $\square$ |
| E2g. No signature... | $\square$ |
| E2h. Non-matching signature . | $\square$ |
| E2i. Voter already voted.. | $\square$ |
| E2j. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2k. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2I. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2m. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2n. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2o. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| E2p. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |
| TOTAL ................................................................................................. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ E1d |  |
| Comments |  |

## SECTION F <br> Election Day Activities

- F1 and F2 ask for turnout figures for the November 2016 general election and the source used to arrive at this number.
- F3 asks for the number of first time voters who registered to vote by mail and, under HAVA 303(b), were required to provide identification in order to vote.
- F4 asks for information on electronic poll books or electronic lists of voters that may have been used.
- F5 and F6 ask for information on printed poll books or printed lists of voters that may have been used.
- F7 asks for the type of primary voting equipment used.
- F8 solicits any additional comments jurisdictions may wish to share regarding their Election Day experiences.

F1. Enter the total number of people in your jurisdiction who participated in the November 2016 general election. Include all types of voters (civilian and military) by all types of ballots. Include rejected provisional ballots only if your jurisdiction credits the person's vote history even though the provisional ballot was rejected.

F1a. Total $\square$ ... $\qquad$ $\square$ Data not available

Next, divide the total number of people who participated in the November 2016 general election (as entered in F1a) into the following categories. The amounts should sum to the total provided in F1a.



## F1 Comments

$\square$

F2. Indicate the source used to arrive at the total number of voters entered in F1a. (Select only one source.)...... Number of voters checked off by poll workers or who signed poll books at physical polling places plus the number of UOCAVA and other absentee or early voters..... Number of ballots counted at precincts and/or at a central location (including UOCAVA and other absentee or early vote ballots)........ Number of voters generated after "vote history" has been added.... Number of votes cast for the highest office on the ballot..... Other: $\rightarrow$ comments: $\qquad$
F2 Comments
$\square$

F3. HAVA 303(b) states that all first-time voters in a State who registered by mail are required to provide identification in order to vote and have their ballot counted. Enter the number of first-time voters who provided identification and had their ballot counted for the November 2016 general election in your jurisdiction.

F3a. Total $\qquad$ ...........Data not available $\qquad$Not applicable

F3 Comments
$\square$

F4. Were electronic poll books or electronic lists of voters used at the polling place for the November 2016 general election in your jurisdiction to (select either Yes or No for each item):

|  | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Sign voters in |  |  |
| b. Update voter history. |  |  |
| c. Look up polling places.................................................... $\square$ |  |  |
| d. Other $\rightarrow$ comments: |  |  |
| e. Information un |  |  |

## F4 Comments

$\square$

F5. Did your jurisdiction use printed lists of registered voters at the polls in the November 2016 Federal general election?
Yes ....................................... $\square \rightarrow$ Continue to F6
No........................................ $\square \rightarrow$ Skip to F7
Information unavailable ............. $\square \rightarrow$ Skip to F7

## F5 Comments

$\square$

F6. Did your State print and ship the printed poll books to your local jurisdiction or did your jurisdiction arrange for the printing of the poll books? (Select only one.)
State printed poll books and shipped to jurisdiction.....................................
Jurisdiction arranged for printing of poll books ..............................................
Combination of printing by the State and local jurisdiction ..........................
Information unavailable ...........................................................................

F6 Comments
$\square$

F7. Enter information on the number and type of voting equipment used for the 2016 November general election. Then, for each type of voting equipment, please identify how the machines were used in the voting process and where the ballots from that machine type were tallied. Do not include backup systems that were not actually used.

| Type of Equipment | Number <br> Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally <br> (select all that apply) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F7a. Direct Recording <br> Electronic (DRE) <br> (Not Equipped with Voter <br> Verified Paper Audit Trail <br> (VVPAT)) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## F7a Comments

$\square$

| Type of Equipment | Number Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7b. Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) (Equipped with VVPAT) | $\square$ Not Available | $\square$ Not Available | $\square$ Not Available | $\underset{\text { Available }}{\square}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \square \text { Not } \\ \text { Available } \end{array}$ | $\square$ In-Precinct regular ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Special device accessible to disabled voters | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Provisional Ballot voting | $\square$ A Central Location $\square$ Precinct/Polling Place $\square$ Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Early Vote Site voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Not Available |  |

## F7b Comments

$\square$

| Type of Equipment | Number Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7c. Electronic system that prints voter choices on an optical scan ballot (hybrid of a DRE and an optical scan system) | $\square \text { Available }$ | $\square$ Not Available | $\begin{array}{\|l} \square \text { Not } \\ \text { Available } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\square \text { Not }$ | $\square$ In-Precinct regular ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Special device accessible to disabled voters | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Provisional Ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Early Vote Site voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Not Available |  |

## F7c Comments

$\square$

| Type of Equipment | Number Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7d. Optical/Digital Scan | Number of counters: | $\square_{\text {Available }}^{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\square \text { Not }$ | $\square \text { Not }$ | $\square$ In-Precinct regular ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Special device accessible to disabled voters | A Central Location $\square$ Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  | Number of booths: |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Provisional Ballot voting | $\square$ A Central Location $\square$ Precinct/Polling Place $\square$ Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Early Vote Site voting | $\square$ A Central Location $\square$ Precinct/Polling Place $\square$ Not Available |
|  | $\square$ Not Available |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Absentee | $\square$ A Central Location $\square$ Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Not Available |  |

F7d Comments
$\square$

| Type of Equipment | Number <br> Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use <br> (select all that apply) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F7e. Punch Card |  |  |  |  |  |  |

F7e Comments
$\square$

| Type of Equipment | Number Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7f. Lever | $\square$ Not Available | $\square \text { Not }$ | $\square \text { Not }$ | $\square$ Not Available | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ In-Precinct regular ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Special device accessible to disabled voters | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Early Vote Site voting | A Central Location $\square$ Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Not Available |  |

F7f Comments
$\square$



| Type of Equipment | Number Used | Make | Model | Version | Vendor | Machine Use (select all that apply) | Location of Vote Tally (select all that apply) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7i. Other | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \square \text { Not } \\ \text { Available } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \square \text { Not } \\ \text { Available } \end{array}$ | $\square$ In-Precinct regular ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Special device accessible to disabled voters | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Provisional Ballot voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Early Vote Site voting | A Central Location Precinct/Polling Place Not Available Place |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Absentee | A Central Location Not Available |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ Not Available |  |

F7i Comments


F8. The U.S. Election Assistance Commission welcomes any general comments the jurisdiction may wish to share regarding its Election Day experiences (e.g., problems with voting system anomalies*, recounts, staffing, challenges to eligibility, long lines, etc.), or noteworthy success in administering the November 2016 general election. Please feel free to attach additional pages as necessary
An anomaly is defined as an irregular or inconsistent action or response from the voting system or system component resulting in some disruption to the election process. Incidents resulting from administrator error or procedural deficiencies are not considered anomalies for purposes of this survey question (EAC Voting Systems Testing and Certification Program Manual).
$\square$
END OF SURVEY

## THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS SURVEY

* This information collection is required for the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to meet its statutory requirements under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301), the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) ( 42 U.S.C. $1973 \mathrm{gg}-1$ et seq.), and the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voters Act (UOCAVA) (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1). Respondent's obligation to reply to this information collection is mandatory as required under NVRA (42 U.S.C. $1973 \mathrm{gg}-1$ et seq.) and UOCAVA (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1); respondents include the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Territories. This information will be made publicly available on the EAC Web site (http://www.eac.gov). According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB Control No. 3265-0006 (expires 5/31/2013). The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 88 hours per State response. This estimate includes the time for reviewing the instructions, gathering information, and completing the form. Comments regarding this burden estimate should be sent the U.S. Election Assistance Commission - 2016 Election Administration and Voting Survey, 1335 East West Highway, Suite 4300, Silver Spring, MD 20910.



[^0]:    Pennsylvania: this state reported: "at this time, we cannot differentiate between active and inactive from our point in time snapshot of the voter registration numbers."

[^1]:    General note: negative numbers in the "Not Categorized" column mean that the sum of the registration forms received for each category (items A5b to A5I) add up to more applications than the total applications received reported by the state (item A 5 a ).
    lowa, Louisiana, Oregon, Wyoming, New Jersey, Delaware and Idaho: classified updates and corrections to registrations as "Other" (items A5b to A5I). These were re-recorded as "Change to name, party, etc" (item A5f).

    Louisiana: this state reports that: "address changes across jurisdictions are counted as new registrations"
    Michigan: this state reports that: "'New valid registrations' (item A5b) reflects voters who registered from the first time in Michigan and voters who moved from one jurisdiction to another"

    Missouri, lowa: categorized "Returned first ID" or "Received incomplete" as "Other" (A5h-A5I). They were re-categorized as "Invalid or Rejected" (A5e)
    Nebraska: this state reports: "Nebraska law does not allow for pre-registrations under 18 years"

[^2]:    Expiration Date 04/30/2017

